

## \*Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the efforts made by the Veterans' Administration to provide information on benefits due incarcerated veterans.

6226 Dirksen Building

10:00 a.m.

## Energy and Natural Resources

## Energy Resources and Materials Production Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Outer Continental Shelf Leasing program.

3110 Dirksen Building

9:30 a.m.

## Labor and Human Resources

To resume hearings on S. 446, proposed Equal Employment Opportunity for the Handicapped Act.

4232 Dirksen Building

## CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Subcommittee on Science, Research

and Technology of the Committee on Science and Technology, to examine U.S. policies and initiatives of the U.S. Conference on Science and Technology for Development.

5110 Dirksen Building

JUNE 8

9:30 a.m.

## Select on Ethics

To continue hearings in conjunction with the investigation of Senator Talmadge's alleged abuse of certain financial reporting rules of the Senate.

1202 Dirksen Building

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 31, 1979

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rev. George J. Kramer, former pastor, St. Pius X Catholic Church, Moberly, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Continue to bless us abundantly, gracious Heavenly Father, who in overflowing love has given this Nation blessings surpassing all other nations, to bring this people to love You; yet we have often responded selfishly, demanding personal fulfillment, and often responded waywardly and disinterestedly to Your love and call; but Your benevolence is not for ourselves, but for sharing, so that Your holy name may be praised.

I beseech You, loving Father, amid the many crises among our people, to grant to our leaders special graces of enlightenment of mind, benevolence of spirit, and stalwartness of heart for decisions of righteousness.

Grant to these men and women, whom we ourselves have chosen, guidance into Your holy ways and purposes so that Your holy will may be fulfilled and that all citizens may become perfect ministers of Your love and graciousness to all.

I ask this in Jesus' name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## FATHER GEORGE KRAMER

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the guest chaplain for today. He is Father George Kramer who is presently working toward his doctorate of ministry at Catholic University. His most recent position was parish priest of the St. Pius X Church in Moberly, Mo.

Father Kramer is a true Missourian having been born in Bonnots Mill, Mo. He received his education at the Kenrick Seminary in St. Louis, Mo., between

1954 and 1962. He was ordained on April 7, 1962, in Jefferson City, Mo.

His spiritual services have benefited many throughout the Ninth Congressional District. Father Kramer has served in parishes such as Holy Rosary in Monroe City, Blessed Sacrament in Hannibal, Immaculate Conception in Macon, and St. Pius X in Moberly.

After finishing his doctorate work at Catholic University, Father Kramer will return to the Jefferson City Diocese and will work in parish facilitation for change, lay ministry, and family counseling. It is a pleasure to welcome Father Kramer here today and receive his inspirational message.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON BILL MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1979

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making supplemental appropriations for the year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT HOUSE ENERGY COMMITTEE

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis continues to wreak havoc in this petroleum-dependent Nation. The dilemma faced by our 220 million citizens is a real one. The Nation must now decide between a possible gasoline and home heating oil shortage, a massive conservation program, or a rapidly increasing rate of inflation caused by higher spot market prices. The choice must be made now.

In an attempt to streamline the legis-

lative process, and consolidate under one umbrella energy issues that have thus far been considered by 5 full committees and 14 subcommittees, I am today offering a resolution that will do just that.

This measure will create a permanent, standing House Energy Committee that will consider the energy matters that are so vital to the survival of this great country.

The need for such a committee is apparent to all Members; the House has become too fractionalized to act in concert. We must forge ahead as a unit. The one standing Energy Committee will offer some unity to this body.

THE DANGER OF POWER DIVORCED FROM RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, when power is divorced from responsibility, the danger of misuse is always there. That is why the media is to be complimented—for the most part—in exercising its enormous power within a framework of self-imposed responsibility.

When responsibility is divorced from power, as in the Nixon and Ford administrations, when the White House got most of the blame for the actions or omissions of a hostile Congress, that too is a frustrating situation.

However, when an administration and the Congress are possessed of overwhelming power and responsibility as this Democratic administration is, then the inept and ineffective exercise of this power and responsibility deserves all the criticism a free society can muster.

The financial pages this morning tell us our foreign trade deficit surged again in April to staggering proportions, the market suffered sharp losses, and we seem further from developing a workable energy policy than ever.

The dollar is down, inflation is up, and as a nation we have lost confidence in ourselves.

It is painfully clear that leading this country is beyond the capacity of the majority party. We can only pray that

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House Proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

there will be something left of our country to salvage after the 1980 elections.

# PRINT 3 MILLION AND TAKE 1 MILLION FOR YOURSELF

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, David Ottaway, in writing about Idi Amin's economic atrocities, discussed a salesman for a British banknote firm who personally negotiated a contract with the former dictator of Uganda for printing up 2 million Ugandan shillings worth of 100 shilling notes. "At the close of their conversation," said Mr. Ottaway, the salesman "gingerily asked how he was to be paid."

"Print 3 million and take 1 million for yourself," Amin angrily retorted."

Inflation, the expansion of the money supply, helped destroy Uganda's economy, along with other forms of government regulation and interference. Amin doubled the money supply in his last 2 years as dictator, flooding the country with paper money. Prices naturally skyrocketed.

Idi Amin is no longer oppressing the people of Uganda, but his monetary policies live on, in more moderate form, at the U.S. Federal Reserve Board.

We will never have stable prices until we stop flooding our country with paper dollars, and solving—or trying to solve—our problems by printing more money. It will not work for us, any more than it did for Idi Amin.

□ 1010

## DOD SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATIONS ACT OF 1979

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 271

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, sections 401(a) and 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) to the contrary notwithstanding, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2575) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1979, in addition to amounts previously authorized, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and said substitute shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consid-

eration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 2575, the House shall proceed, sections 401(a) and 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) to the contrary notwithstanding, to the consideration of the bill S. 429, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 2575 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN). Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 271 is an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate on the bill H.R. 2575, the Department of Defense supplemental appropriations authorization for fiscal year 1979. The time is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Since H.R. 2575 is a supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1979, the rule provides for an emergency waiver of points of order against the bill for failure to comply with section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 402 (a) bars the consideration of any bill which authorizes new budget authority unless that bill has been reported on or before May 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year. The Budget Committee supports this waiver.

House Resolution 271 also provides for technical waivers of points of order against the bill as introduced for failure to comply with section 401(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 401 (a) provides that it shall not be in order to consider a measure containing new contract authority unless the authority is limited to such extent or in such amounts as provided in appropriation acts. Although the bill as introduced is in violation of section 401(a), a committee amendment has cured the Budget Act problem, and the Budget Committee has no objection to this waiver so that the bill and the committee amendment may be considered by the House.

The resolution also makes in order consideration of an amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Armed Services Committee, now printed in the bill, for purposes of amendment under the 5-minute rule. The substitute is to be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections and upon conclusion of consideration of the bill, a motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Should the House pass H.R. 2575, the resolution will allow the House to con-

sider S. 429, the other body's fiscal year 1979 Department of Defense supplemental. Here again, points of order for failure to comply with sections 401(a) and 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act are waived, and the resolution will allow the House to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to substitute the language of the House passed bill.

Mr. Speaker, the first budget resolution has provided \$628 million for the acquisition of two *Spruance* class destroyers that are authorized in H.R. 2575. The Armed Services Committee has asked that although the budget resolution does not provide full funding for the supplemental authorization, the full amount in the authorization should be approved by the House so that priority decisions as to which programs can be funded in fiscal year 1979 can be made in a timely fashion by the Department of Defense at the direction of the Congress.

In view of the important national security needs contained in H.R. 2575, I would urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and proceed to consideration of the bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The able gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has explained the provisions of the rule and has gone in depth into the measure itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should have a defense posture second to none. This Nation must always be militarily strong.

□ 1020

At the same time, we all should be concerned about the massive buildup of the Russian fleet in the Pacific Ocean, in the Indian Ocean, and in the Persian Gulf. Word has reached me that this is a very significant buildup and that unless something happens in the way of strengthening on our side, then something really terrible could happen by cutting off our oil supply. It would be a terrific dilemma. It would be a great crisis, one which we would have to face should that event occur; so I have always supported a program that this Nation should be militarily strong, second to none.

This defense supplemental appropriation for 1979 is most reasonable. It does not go far enough, but at the same time we face it today as it is before us.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the rule be adopted and the measure be adopted by the House by a tremendous majority.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2575) to authorize appro-



priations for fiscal year 1979, in addition to amounts previously authorized, for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole and requests the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MYERS) to assume the chair temporarily.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2575, with Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Armed Services Committee, I bring to the floor of the House today H.R. 2575, the Department of Defense supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1979.

The bill as reported by our committee is \$543.8 million below the amount requested by the President.

The bill provides a total supplemental authorization of \$1.458 billion.

The authorization includes \$1.524 billion for procurement, and \$406 million for research, development, test, and evaluation.

To understand this supplemental it is necessary to understand a little background.

The original fiscal year 1979 authorization bill was vetoed by the President. As a result, a \$2 billion aircraft carrier, not requested by the President, was removed. The President requested inclusion of \$2 billion for other defense items. Because of the press of time last session, Congress merely passed an authorization without the aircraft carrier, and signaled that a supplemental could be considered later.

So this supplemental was allowed for in the continuing budget process.

On January 29, 1979, a supplemental was submitted. In February, as a result of the political crisis, the Government of Iran informed the United States that it was canceling the purchase of various weapon systems.

On February 28, 1979, the administration submitted a revision which called for the deletion of various programs from the original supplemental and substitution of weapons which became available as a result of the Iranian cancellations. The dollar total of the supplemental, \$2.2 billion, did not change. The revised sup-

plemental request was introduced as H.R. 2575.

So even with this supplemental, the President is not getting some of the defense items he believes need to be furnished in fiscal year 1979.

The committee did not simply approve the President's supplemental request. The committee reduced it by more than 25 percent. It includes only items of two kinds:

First. Items made available from Iran that our forces need and that can be obtained at a significant reduction in cost. Failure to buy these items would not be an example of fiscal restraint.

For example, the two ships in this bill are more than 50 percent complete. Almost of all the U.S. Government furnished equipment has been delivered. We can buy them at a saving of \$200 million per ship.

The distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) will discuss these Iranian ships and their potential value to the U.S. Navy.

Second. Programs for which the funding is required in fiscal year 1979.

In the R. & D. category are important items that should not be delayed. This includes strategic programs related to our strategic deterrence that the Secretary of Defense called the top priority matter in the bill. An examination of the committee report will show that in the cases where any of these R. & D. items could be delayed, the committee has deferred them. In all, the committee deferred some \$120 million in R. & D. projects and added only one R. & D. item.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) will address these matters in the course of this debate.

I would like now to devote much of my own time to a discussion of one matter that I think is as important as anything in the defense area this year.

That is the authorization requested by the President to complete consideration of alternatives for the basing mode for the M-X missile and to begin full scale engineering development (FSED) of the missile. Language inserted by the committee is designed to require that a decision on the basing mode be made at the time the missile goes into FSED.

Continuing the land-based leg of our strategic triad in a survivable mode is crucial to our national security in the years ahead. The language that the committee has provided in the bill requires the President to continue with full scale engineering development of the multiple protective structure (MPS) system at the same time as full scale engineering development starts on the missile itself, unless the Secretary of Defense informs us that another system is militarily or technologically superior and more cost effective, or unless the President tells us that the system is not in the national interest.

At the time of the committee hearings, there were two systems being considered; the MPS system and the so-called air mobile system where missiles would be carried in aircraft dispersed at airfields in various locations. There are advantages to a land-based system, that is, the silo-based system, that are simply

not attainable with an aircraft system. These include freedom from tactical warning; endurance—that is, the ability to ride out an attack indefinitely and still strike back at the enemy; time-urgent hard target kill capability; and relatively lower cost and easier maintenance.

It is estimated that an air mobile system would cost at least \$9 billion more than the MPS system and would be at least twice as expensive to maintain. Subsequent to committee markup, it appears the Defense Department has concluded the air mobile system is not viable, in part because of the high cost. But the administration is considering other alternatives, and the President has not made a final decision.

The leaders of the Air Force who have made the technical studies, and the majority of distinguished outside witnesses that we have heard—and we have heard them from all spectrums of opinion—prefer the MPS system.

Nevertheless, if the President wishes to tell us that in the national interest he wants another system, he may do so. But he should tell us now, as Congress prepares to act on the SALT treaty.

If a SALT treaty is approved, it should be approved in the context of knowing what our strategic capabilities vis-a-vis the Soviets will be after that treaty is in effect.

If we fail to shore up the survivability of the land-based leg of our strategic forces in a timely manner, all the treaties in the world are not going to protect our country's security.

The President has a right to recommend any system that he wants. The Secretary of Defense has a right to state his judgment on military or technological superiority.

But we have a right to demand that those judgments and those decisions be made and be submitted to Congress in a timely manner.

The ultimate decision is going to be made by Congress.

I would say to you two things more on this issue—and again, I think it is as important an issue as you will vote on in this Congress.

First, that what is important to the survival of this system is the basing mode. I tell you unhesitatingly to build a whole new big MX missile without a new basing mode would be a waste of money. The Secretary of Defense stated under questioning that the survivability of the system depends on the basing mode more than the missile. So to say that you are going to go ahead with the missile and not the basing mode is foolish. A decision on how that missile is to be based is what determines whether or not it has any survivability and therefore whether or not it has deterrent capability.

The second thing I would say is that I think it will come to be understood that with this language we are doing the President a favor. I say that simply because a firm understanding that we are going to continue to develop the strategic systems improves the climate for the SALT treaty in this Congress.

I would now like to briefly note vari-

ous reductions made in the President's request:

The supplemental request included \$460 million for 55 F-16 aircraft. The committee found that the Air Force does not have an urgent requirement for 55 additional aircraft in fiscal year 1979 and that the aircraft could be sold to Israel in line with the recent Middle East peace agreement. Accordingly, the committee deleted the entire amount requested. The supplemental request erroneously included \$21 million for the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) modifications. Since \$28.5 million was authorized to be appropriated in the fiscal year 1979 Department of Defense Appropriation Authorization Act (Public Law 95-485) and only \$7.5 million has been appropriated, \$21 million in authorization is still available for appropriation. The committee deleted the entire request.

Another deletion was in the Army missiles spares and repair parts account in the amount of \$25 million. Army witnesses testified that this request was not an emergency and could be handled through a reprogramming action. The committee deleted the entire amount.

The committee made one addition to title I and that was for ALQ-131 electronic countermeasures (ECM) pods, which can be used on most Air Force aircraft. Testimony indicated that this ECM program was one of the Air Force's highest priorities. Including the program in the fiscal 1979 supplemental will avoid an increase in the cost of the pods.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of our Seapower Subcommittee, Mr. BENNETT, and his ranking member, Mr. SPENCE; the distinguished chairman of the R. & D. Subcommittee, Mr. ICHORD, and his ranking member, Mr. DICKINSON; and our distinguished full committee ranking member who is also the ranking member of my Subcommittee on Procurement, Mr. BOB WILSON, for the careful and knowledgeable way that they have approached this bill. I also wish to thank all members of the committee for their diligent work on this legislation.

I present this bill to you today because there are requirements in the area of national defense which are necessary for us to deal with in a supplemental. When unforeseen events happen, we have to make judgments as to our needs and sometimes we have to change priorities. To ignore the need for this supplemental would, in the long run, I believe, mean a waste of the taxpayers' money.

I urge all of you to support this legislation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1030

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2575, the Department of Defense supplemental authorization bill for fiscal year 1979. H.R. 2575 addresses requirements for defense which cannot wait until next year.

The programs authorized in this bill would total \$1,458,400,000 for fiscal year

1979. This is \$543.8 million less than the \$2,002,000,000 requested by the President. The committee carefully examined the President's supplemental request during its defense posture hearings this year, and retained only the most important programs in this bill.

I feel the committee was particularly mindful of the budgetary pressures placed on Congress at this economically critical time. While over a half a billion dollars in reductions were made, only two relatively small additions were made to the bill. These were:

Forty million dollars for procurement of ALQ-131 electronic countermeasures (ECM) pods, one of the Air Force's highest priorities which provides self-protection capability for the A-10, A-7, F-4, RF-4, F-16, and F-111 aircraft; and

Sixty-one and one-half million dollars to develop the Precision Emitter Locator System (PELS), a standoff tactical strike system. We have since determined that authorization for this system could be deferred to the fiscal year 1980 budget and Mr. ICHORD will have an amendment to delete these funds.

The committee made a number of reductions in the bill, totaling \$645.3 million. Most of these reductions were made because of a lack of justification as to their urgency, such as the procurement of 55 F-16 aircraft and accompanying spares and repair parts for \$460 million.

The bill contains some very important programs for national security. These include authorization for:

Funds for research and development of the MX missile and its basing mode, an effort of utmost importance in view of the potential vulnerability of our land-based strategic forces. Included in the bill is language drafted by the committee which expresses the sense of Congress that maintaining a survivable land-based intercontinental ballistic missile system is vital to the security of the United States, that development of a new basing mode for that land-based ICBM is necessary to insure the survivability of the system, and that the development of the MX missile, together with a new basing mode, should proceed so as to achieve initial operational capability (IOC) for both the missile and the basing mode at the earliest practicable date.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this is a crucial item that we must get on with. While we included some \$75 million to go forward with the study for the air mobile version of this, it is our understanding now that the Air Force and the Department of Defense have abandoned this concept or are not insisting on it, and I believe an amendment will be made by the chairman of the committee or by our Subcommittee on Research and Development to delete this amount of money which goes into the air basing or air mobile mode of the MX missile.

The bill also contains \$201.6 million for procurement of Navy missiles and \$628 million for procurement of two DDG-993 *Spruance*-class destroyers made available as a result of the cancellation of these weapons orders by the Government of Iran. Procurement of these will enable the United States to

make substantial savings on missile systems it had already planned to procure, as well as to redress naval ship inventory deficiencies at an early date.

There is also in the bill \$85.1 million for the U.S. share of the agreed-upon contribution by NATO members to the NATO AWACS program. This is a result of over 4 years of negotiations with NATO allies to structure a cooperative program for the acquisition of an airborne early warning and control system. Eleven NATO members signed a multilateral memorandum of understanding in December 1978, establishing this program. The signing of the memorandum established the necessary allied structure, which had not been previously available, to conduct the program. Since this could not be assured when the Congress approved the fiscal year 1979 budget earlier in 1978, additional authorization had to be requested in the supplemental.

May I add parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, that we have been negotiating for some 4 years with the NATO members to secure their agreement to procure the AWACS aircraft as part of the total NATO defense. They have done so. We entered into an agreement with them, and this is a part of the agreement.

In addition to the programs already mentioned, the bill would authorize several critical programs in research and development from the Subcommittee on Research and Development, on which I serve as ranking minority member. These include the following:

Improvements to the TOW anti-tank weapon;

Improvements to the Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN); and

Engineering development of the extended range version of the Pershing II missile system.

Let me underscore the importance of this supplemental by reminding you that the Congress has been particularly concerned over the erosion in funding the defense program and the decline in the defense effort. Although the President has talked much about real growth in defense, after funding delays and debates over which programs are of highest priority the budget is trimmed and trimmed until it is very difficult to show any real growth at all, and it becomes very difficult to devote the needed defense required to counter the massive Soviet military buildup.

I believe this situation is critical, as has been indicated by Defense witnesses in testimony before the Armed Services Committee on U.S. military posture.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in his military posture statement early this session, stated that he considered the fiscal year 1979 Defense supplemental together with the fiscal year 1980 program to be "the lowest level the Nation should risk in light of the difference in momentum (between U.S. and Soviet military trends) and the steps we must take to maintain the military balance."

This authorization bill is relatively small, but extremely important not only for the specific programs detailed in our



report, but for the total fiscal year 1979 defense effort as well.

Let me add that this authorization is not in conflict with the budget resolution for fiscal year 1979. This bill provides authorization for programs and not budget authority. Budget authority is provided in an appropriation bill. The conference report on the budget resolution provided enough leeway for fiscal year 1979 to cover an appropriation equal to the amount of this authorization, \$1.4 billion, so there is no problem in terms of budget limitations. Now it happens that the Senate version of the bill is higher than the House and somewhat higher than the total allowed for in the budget resolution. There will be no problem, of course, if the Senate accepts our bill. Knowing the other body as I do, however, I suspect a conference will be necessary to work out our differences.

In summary, the defense supplemental will address a number of deficiencies in the fiscal year 1979 defense program, meet immediate and critical defense needs, and allow us to proceed with the fiscal year 1980 program without having to compensate for not having funded last year's programs.

I urge your support of this bill.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Dickinson) is a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Committee on Armed Services. I wonder if the gentleman has been advised of an item that appeared in the Washington Post this morning that very conveniently suggests that the CIA has reviewed the figures on the megatonnage of Soviet ICBM warheads and has come to the startling conclusion that it was being much too pessimistic, and that actually the Soviet SS18, for example, now has warheads that yield only 600 kilotons instead of 1.2 megatons as originally believed.

I wonder whether that information, which, of course, comes at a very convenient time as far as the SALT treaty problem is concerned, was ever presented to the gentleman's subcommittee and whether the gentleman would have any comment on it.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, let me respond by saying, first, no, this information was not presented to our committee.

Second, this is exactly counter to what we had been briefed in executive sessions, and later most of the information we were given was declassified so we could use it.

But let me say that while I do not plan to go into it at this time, I have a series of charts which I intend to use—and I am sure my committee chairman does, too—during consideration of the 1980 defense authorization bill which will show a comparison of the megatonnage and the throw weight and the numbers of missiles which were presented to us this year prior to our markup, reflecting a unanimous conclusion of our entire intelligence community. They show just

the opposite of what was reported in this morning's paper.

While I did briefly scan the article this morning, I did not go into it in depth. But this revelation, if it is in fact true, comes about 1 month after we had been given entirely opposite testimony by the highest ranking members of our intelligence community.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me that this is another example of the CIA coming up with intelligence information which very conveniently suits policy considerations rather than something that is based solely on fact.

I note that the article also indicates—and this apparently is also from the CIA—that U.S. warheads of the new Mark 12A variety are going to carry an explosive power of 375 kilotons and are more accurate than the Soviet SS18.

Is it not true that the Mark 12A is not even deployed as yet, whereas the SS18 is not only as accurate as ours but is also actually deployed?

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that from the information I have, that is correct. The "Big Bertha" or the SS18 is indeed a formidable weapon. It has been flight tested and is being deployed, and it is a matter of very real concern.

□ 1040

If you start talking about CIA intelligence reports, it might be of interest for the people of this country to know. As I say, I will develop this more fully when we bring up the 1980 defense authorization bill. But the intelligence community has come in and have told us this spring that they have underestimated the level of effort by the Soviets both in research and in total procurement by about 50 percent. We were also told that the reassessment of the level of effort in North Korea of the threat facing South Korea had been underestimated by about 50 percent, and it was, in effect, twice the threat that we were told when the announcement was made about withdrawing our forces from South Korea. That sort of made General Singlaub look pretty good.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will yield, this disturbs me, as I am sure it disturbs the gentleman in the well. It looks as though our intelligence is being used for political purposes. It is just as though you ran a fever, but threw away the thermometer and got one that suggested that your fever was nonexistent and your temperature was back to normal. I think we are playing a dangerous game.

Mr. DICKINSON. I cannot affirm or deny what was reported in this morning's Washington Post because this is all new information to me and, I am sure, to the members of the committee. It is contrary to the facts given to us in executive session by the intelligence community.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2575 to authorize the appropriation of funds for development and

procurement of needed weapons systems for the Department of Defense.

Last fall, the President vetoed the fiscal year 1979 defense authorization bill because it contained a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. At that time, he stated a supplemental bill would, indeed, be submitted to restore the \$1.9 billion loss from the Defense budget resulting from this veto.

To maintain the necessary defense expenditure to keep our country in the defense position it should be, H.R. 2575 answers that commitment and clearly represents the intent of the Congress to achieve the level of defense spending which the Congress sought to implement for fiscal year 1979.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his testimony on March 9, 1979, stated that probably the most urgent item the Navy was requesting in the supplemental authorization bill is the \$97.7 million for the final settlement of outstanding claims with Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. Previously \$74 million in claims were paid to Newport News from prior appropriations. The balance will be paid by this supplemental authorization. This settlement cleans up the shipbuilding claims problems and its prompt funding is critical.

The settlement deadline was March 31, 1979. Since the supplemental authorization bill was not passed by March 31, 1979, the Navy used 1979 cost growth appropriations to pay for these claims. The funds in this supplemental will be used to restore those moneys. With this final claims payment, no new settlements are currently anticipated.

A significant portion of the funds authorized in this bill, some \$628 million, provides for the acquisition of two DDG-993 class destroyers currently under construction. These very capable destroyers will be delivered to the Navy in fiscal year 1981 at cost savings of some \$200 million per ship should they be purchased in today's inflated dollars. There is no argument that the Navy continues to fall short of surface ships. These valuable assets at such cost savings cannot be ignored. Furthermore, these ships can be acquired much more rapidly than if we were to authorize new ships.

In addition to the \$200 million savings per ship the United States can achieve by acquiring these two destroyers, it is estimated that, should we cancel the contract, the termination costs are on the order of \$50 million per ship. Over 98 percent of the material for these ships such as steel, gas turbines, gears, machinery, et cetera, has already been ordered. This material takes years to build and deliver. Should we now cancel this contract, the vendors of this equipment have legal recourse to cover their actual expenses and obligation to their subcontractors. Therefore, on each one of these ships there would be a savings of about a quarter of a billion dollars if we acquire them in the method suggested in this bill.

In short, by not acquiring these ships, the United States foregoes the opportunity to obtain savings of \$200 million per ship and then must pay termination

costs of approximately \$50 million per ship.

Unfortunately, over the past few weeks of debate on the budget resolution, our colleagues may have received the impression that these destroyers are not the first class naval vessels they are. I must set the record straight on that point. These destroyers are identical to our proven *Spruance* class destroyers but, in addition, have a much improved air-defense system. This air-defense system is essentially the same as that on the *Virginia* class of nuclear guided missile cruisers. These ships are first rate, highly capable destroyers sorely needed by the Navy.

Another impression that may be of confusion to our colleagues is that by acquiring these destroyers we are essentially bailing out the new Government of Iran. This impression could not be further from the real facts. The legal contract to build these ships is between the U.S. Government and the private shipbuilder. Should this contract not be fulfilled, the penalties associated with contract termination will be borne by the U.S. Government. However, by fulfilling the contract as currently stated, we will be able to purchase these ships at tremendous cost savings.

The President has requested that the two destroyers be included in his supplemental budget request for defense. The Congress should support him in his effort.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do have some cautions regarding these ships the gentleman mentioned a moment ago. To clarify in my mind, there are four such ships originally contracted; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. SKELTON. And the Senate has proposed the United States acquire all four of these ships; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is what we should do.

Mr. SKELTON. They are all of what class again, please?

Mr. BENNETT. The same ship, the 993.

Mr. SKELTON. What does that mean?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) has expired.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. SKELTON. If the gentleman will yield further, what class ship are they, please? What tonnage?

Mr. BENNETT. 993, the same ship. They are improved over the others.

Mr. SKELTON. Are these ships much different than what we would have originally contracted for had the United States initially ordered them from the shipbuilders?

Mr. BENNETT. They would not be any different at all.

Mr. SKELTON. In other words, we do not have to refurbish them or add to them? They would be able to go on line

just as if they had been initially contracted?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. There are some improvements that we plan to make on a few of the new ships of this class yet to be authorized like adding the *Aegis*, but it is not clear that Congress would be willing to pay that kind of money at this particular time. They might be added, on another follow-on ship. We only have 35 of the ships of this class now and we need 72 ultimately.

Mr. SKELTON. So actually four would not be too many?

Mr. BENNETT. No; it would fall far short. That would bring us only to 39, and we have a 72 requirement.

Mr. SKELTON. But the gentleman's committee recommended two; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. We only recommend two because at the time of our action only two were released by Iran, now two more are available.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) has again expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, if I might, I would like to devote my few minutes to a discussion of the shipbuilding portion of this supplemental request. At the risk of repeating what has already been said, I would still like to refresh the memory of the Members present as to what happened last year.

When the President vetoed the nuclear aircraft carrier, which would have cost about \$2 billion, the main reason given for that veto was that the Navy needed more ships, and with these \$2 billion we could buy more ships—all kinds of numbers were mentioned—maybe four or five more ships. Many Members in this body, knowing the Navy needed more ships, went along with that reasoning, that we could maybe get four or five more ships for the Navy, much needed ships for the Navy, if we went along with the President's veto of the nuclear carrier.

□ 1050

Right away, the Navy put together a preferred shopping list of what they would like to have for that \$2 billion. It included a DD-963 destroyer, an FFG-7 frigate, an SSN-688 submarine, a DDG-993 guided missile destroyer with the improved standard missile, SM-2.

This amounted to a total cost of \$1.6 billion, still much less than the \$2 billion we were going to have to spend on ships.

And then when the first supplemental was presented to us in January of this year, instead of this preferred shopping list the Navy had put together, the request was for only two ships, a frigate, the FFG-7, and a DDG-993 guided missile destroyer, plus funds to cover the Navy claims which had been referred to earlier.

The total amount of this request was \$843.7 million, less than one-half what the Navy had expected to spend on ships.

The question I ask is, did the Members who went along with the argument that we would be able to buy more ships if

we sustained the President's veto of the carrier, only expect to get two ships in return for that one big, large, very needed aircraft carrier? I do not think so.

Then in February of 1979, events in Iran, with which we are all familiar, made available to us, as you have heard earlier, two guided missile destroyers that were being built in this country for Iran. As a matter of fact, four of these types of ships were being built for Iran.

The new supplemental came to us, asking that we buy two of these Iranian guided missile destroyers, plus the funds for ship claims, the total this time amounted to \$725.7 million, there again, less than half of what we expected to get in the way of ships.

Then questions have been asked about the Iranian ships. The Navy did not even ask for them. Was the Navy forced to take these ships to bail out the contractors, and other questions of these types. I would like to answer those questions.

First of all, the Navy did not know about the Iranian ships at the time they submitted the first supplemental. They did not know about the bargain price we would be dealing with. They could not afford to ask for these types of ships at the regular price. The supplemental budget would not afford it.

So this is why the new supplemental came out asking for these two Iranian ships. From the standpoint of the bailout of the contractor, the shipbuilder, they do not lose much, because they receive termination liability costs. If we do not buy these ships, they will be scrapped and would not do anybody any good.

We really should be buying the other two Iranian ships also, because we save about \$200 million on each one of these ships.

These ships are already contracted for, and we could be saving money right now if we bought all four of them instead of just these two.

The Navy needs more ships. The Navy needs many more ships. We do not have enough ships, with the ones we are retiring, to meet our commitments throughout the world. The Navy needs more ships.

The current 5-year shipbuilding program is only one-half as large as the Navy needs to keep current from the standpoint of our commitments. We need to build 160 ships during the next 5 years, and this request has been cut to 67 ships.

In addition, when we cut back on the shipbuilding program of our Navy, we throw our shipbuilding capacity into havoc.

Jobs are lost. Shipbuilding skills are lost and it takes time and effort and money to ever rebuild this capability.

This supplemental that we are considering today is the first short step in trying to get back on the right track of building more ships for the Navy.

I ask for the support of this supplemental.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for yielding this time to me.



I rise to ask the Members of the Committee for their support for title II of H.R. 2575, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation.

The budget request for R.D.T. & E. totaled \$456.5 million.

The committee recommends an authorization of \$406 million or a reduction of \$59.5 million.

Perhaps the most important committee recommendation in this bill is the addition of legislative language to title II stating that it is the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense proceed immediately with the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) system that will assure system survivability against a preemptive Soviet nuclear attack.

The need to insure the survivability of the ICBM leg of our strategic triad is certainly a mission whose time has come. The Members may recall that it was then-Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger who, in 1975, brought the vulnerability of our Minuteman silos to the forefront because of improved Soviet accuracy in their missile systems. Subsequently, practically every strategic systems expert within and outside of Government who has testified before the Committee on Armed Services has acknowledged the fact that Soviet advances in strategic guidance and control technology and systems indeed threaten the survivability of our Minuteman forces. As a result of the committee's hearings, the following observations can be made:

The threat to our Minuteman forces is undisputed.

The major question in the strategic community is not whether our ICBM forces will become vulnerable, but when. The most pessimistic assessment is within 1 or 2 years, while the more optimistic nuclear strategists postulate 4 years.

The survivability of the system is dependent more on the basing mode than on the development of a new missile.

Since it is the responsibility of this Congress to provide for the defense of this country, it is imperative that we direct the Department of Defense to proceed with the development of a survivable ICBM system. The Defense Department has been studying this problem for nearly a decade. The people at the Pentagon have investigated options that included launching ICBM's from railroad cars, from large aircraft, from vertical shelters, and from trenches. The studies to assess the feasibility of launching an ICBM from an aircraft date back to 1962. About 6 years ago the Department of Defense initiated studies of the multiple aim point, or MAP, system which we now refer to as the multiple protective structure (MPS) system. This scheme, in effect, denies the Soviets an aim point, since there is a matrix of silos, of which only one silo contains an actual missile. The committee has substantial testimony from strategic experts stating that the MPS is the most cost and performance effective approach to preserving from the ICBM leg of our triad. The Defense Science Board, a

team of well-known experts in the scientific and military community, strongly endorses the MPS approach in its more recent study.

I know that in recent weeks many people have started to question whether or not MPS is consistent with the pending SALT II treaty. According to the Secretary of Defense, our negotiators provided a clear statement to the Soviets earlier this year stating the U.S. position that the development of a survivable basing mode for the ICBM system—such as the MPS—is not inconsistent with SALT II. Since that time, the committee has repeatedly been advised that the MPS is indeed in consonance with the provisions of the proposed SALT II treaty.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the action recommended by the committee on title II of H.R. 2575 fulfills our objective to provide for the defense of our country at the least possible cost. The committee has denied authorization for those programs requested by the administration that are not urgent or could not be sufficiently justified. The committee, for example, recommended deletion of the Navy's request for \$3 million to initiate the development of a small waterplane area twin hull ship (SWATH)—a system that would be a candidate for Navy missions in the 2000 to 2015 timeframe. What the committee does recommend, however, is full support for those systems that are essential to the future defense of NATO, such as the Pershing II system, and those systems that will enhance our strategic deterrent posture, such as the air-launched cruise missile and the corresponding modifications that are necessary to convert the B-52 aircraft for their cruise-missile-carrying role.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the committee's recommendations for title II are responsive to our defense needs, and I urge the support of the Members here today.

I would state at this time that when we read the bill for amendment, it is my intention to offer an amendment reducing the recommended authorization by \$136.5 million.

Now, this will be in the form of two amendments. One will be \$61.5 million for the elimination of PELS. The other amendment will be \$75 million for the elimination of study money for alternate MX basing schemes.

The reason for these two amendments is that time and decisions that have been made have passed by the two money provisions.

In the 1980 request, there is \$61.5 million for the continuing research and development of the PELS system, which is the precision emitter locator system. So we do not need the \$61.5 million in this supplemental bill.

As far as the \$75 million is concerned, I would state that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON), offered an amendment to delete \$65 million of the \$75 million for alternate MX basing.

I opposed the amendment in subcommittee and in the full committee, not necessarily for the reason that I thought that the gentleman from Alabama did not have a good point. He did have a good point. The administration made a

very poor case for the \$75 million because the money was requested for researching and studying the air mobile concept of dumping an ICBM from a C-5A or a DC-10 or a 747.

There is no question about it. We can dump an ICBM from a 747 or C-5A. In fact, we have done it. I believe we have dumped it from a C-5A. There is no problem technically with doing that, but the concept of putting your ICBM in the air is so absurd that it is difficult for any person even minutely acquainted with the problem to understand why the concept could ever be seriously considered.

□ 1100

But anyway, time has passed us by. I observed that the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from Michigan stated in their dissenting views that the air mobile ICBM, reportedly favored by the White House, is heavily opposed by the committee on the grounds that it will cost \$40 to \$45 billion, as opposed to \$20 billion for MPS.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. It is my understanding if the White House ever favored the air mobile system, they are certainly not favoring it now. They finally saw the light, and this \$75 million was for studying the air mobile version.

Because of the language we put in the bill in regard to MPS it was my position we should not get in a position where we could be accused of foreclosing the administration from studying any alternate MX basing system. But now that the air mobile system is out, apparently even by the White House, as indicated by the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from Michigan, certainly we can eliminate and save the \$75 million. So I will offer an amendment in that regard.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Well, it is not my usual way to say I told you so, but I am very glad that the gentleman saw it my way, and we are deleting the money we tried to take out in subcommittee and in full committee, because actually the gentleman has stated the case correctly. The Air Force itself was not enthusiastic about it. As a matter of fact, one of the project officers, when we asked him about the comparison after studying all modes, what his attitude toward the air launch was, he said "it's dumb." It will cost twice as much and will be more vulnerable.

So, I think the Air Force and the Department of Defense is correct now. They have more or less abandoned this. This money is not needed, and when the gentleman offers his amendment I certainly will support it.

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that I agree with his characterization of its being dumb.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, wearing another hat as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, I would like to join my colleagues and subcommittee chairman in asking for support for the committee's recommendations on title II of H.R. 2575, the fiscal year 1979 Department of Defense supplemental budget request for research, development, test and evaluation.

I personally know of no strategic analyst who questions the growing vulnerability of our land based missile force to a Soviet first strike. And, as the gentleman from Missouri has noted, it is urgent that we move forward in fielding a survivable land based ICBM system.

I know there are some who believe a SALT II agreement might obviate the need to deploy a new ICBM system. I must be candid and tell you, however, that having recently served on a special SALT II panel of the Armed Services Committee, I see very little in SALT II that will in any way lessen the susceptibility of our current silo-based Minuteman force to the possibility of a devastating Soviet first strike. The simple facts are that since the signing of SALT I in 1972, Soviet strategic weapons developments have gone nearly unabated and we see an ever increasing disparity between our capability and theirs.

Only a few short years ago Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird gave a rosy forecast in his "Final Report to the Congress" in January 1973:

The historic ABM Treaty and interim agreement on strategic offensive arms (SALT I) concluded in Moscow last May are the first steps toward mutually agreed restraint and arms limitation between the nuclear superpowers. Through them the United States and the U.S.S.R. have enhanced strategic stability, reduced world tension, precluded a significant upturn in the strategic arms race in the near term, and laid the foundation for the follow-on negotiations which began last November. In terms of United States objectives, SALT I improved our deterrent posture, braked the rapid build-up of Soviet strategic forces, and permitted us to continue those programs that are essential to maintaining the sufficiency of our long-term strategic nuclear deterrent.

In contrast to that rather glowing projection, today the current Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, states:

Unfortunately, longer-term stability is not fully assured, and the future competition in strategic capabilities is likely to become more dynamic than need be the case. As I pointed out last year, the main impulse for this dynamism comes from the Soviet Union in the form of a large ICBM force with an expanding hard target kill capability, a much-publicized civil defense effort, and the likelihood of significantly upgraded air defense capabilities.

It is clear that the SALT process has done little to date to brake the Soviet strategic momentum and, even with a SALT II agreement, there is much we must do to maintain our deterrent posture. In my view, the MX program is one of those "musts."

Since the gentleman from Missouri did not dwell on it in his remarks, I want to emphasize the thoroughness with

which the committee examined the supplemental research and development request. The committee deleted \$121 million from the request and recommends support for only 6 of the 12 programs for which funds were requested.

Several programs were deleted because the committee did not believe there was sufficient urgency to justify their inclusion in the supplemental. Others were deleted because of insufficient justification.

As an example, the Navy has yet to define a firm requirement for a Trident II missile. Further, the total Trident II program cost is estimated at nearly \$8 billion. This represents an affordability problem that the Navy has not been able to adequately address. The committee does not believe it is prudent to initiate this program at present and, accordingly, recommends the \$20 million requested in the supplemental for Trident II be denied.

Secretary Brown has indicated that the administration's top priority in this supplemental request is the area of strategic programs followed next by NATO readiness items and then by the Iranian equipment. The committee concurs with this set of priorities. Those programs recommended for support have been carefully reviewed based on their individual merits with particular emphasis placed on the need for near-term funding. Those programs that did not measure up to this test were recommended for deletion from the supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, I solicit full support for the committee's actions on title II of H.R. 2575.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

□ 1110

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I have a different view from that of many of my colleagues who have spoken earlier in the well, and I would like to take these few moments to make that point of view known to all the Members.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a period of fiscal constraint apparently—that is, except for the Pentagon.

The defense budget for fiscal year 1979 and the budget proposed by the President for 1980 continues a pattern of real spending increases for defense begun in 1976.

Given the limit on the Federal budget, increases in defense expenditures are coming directly at the cost of needed and necessary domestic programs. Despite belt tightening in other areas of Government, the Pentagon continues to pursue extraordinarily expensive goals. I tell you, unequivocally, that this country cannot afford, and the military does not need, most of what is in this supplemental authorization.

Defense budget increases do not necessarily produce increases in real military capability. The effectiveness of military spending depends on how the resources are allocated. The most significant problem in the military budget today is not

levels of expenditure, but rather clarification of our foreign policy needs and the resultant defense objectives. We in the Congress must make some hard decisions.

I join most Americans who want their country to have a strong defense. But I expect, and I think most Americans join me in expecting wise and effective expenditures. Unneeded and wasteful Pentagon spending cannot be tolerated.

The instability of nations and governments has caused concern about our place in the world. But, we must understand, this highest of peace time budgets cannot guarantee peace, cannot protect us from nuclear attack, cannot insure victory in another Vietnam, cannot insure favorable regimes in volatile nations and certainly will not assist the domestic economy. Certainly, we cannot and should not attempt to be the policeman of the world. The realities of today dictate the need for a military, but its strength should be measured as to the real needs of America.

The area that raises the biggest concern to many is the potential military challenge of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, we do not reflect sufficiently on the fact that 20 million Soviet citizens lost their lives in World War II. They know first hand and personally the horrors of war. There is nothing in the last 34 years of Soviet history that supports any interpretation that they are inclined to an all-out nuclear war. In fact, no one, including those who point with alarm to Soviet increases, really gives much credence to the possibility of a Soviet attack.

The alarmist raise instead the increase in numbers of Soviet arms and the notion of "perceptions" and possible political consequences.

When analyzing military balances, we must go beyond simplistic tallies. As Secretary Brown has said, such comparisons can be "extraordinarily misleading." Yet the increases in the budget are based on misleading numerical comparisons—military spending, missile numbers, numbers of heavy missiles and factors in NATO against the Warsaw Pact.

The essential question is—after the Soviets do whatever they could—what could we do? The fact is clear, we have the capability for a broad variety of controlled retaliatory attacks, including a substantial capability to destroy Soviet silos. We are not limited to retaliating against Soviet cities. But, if we choose to—we have an awesome capacity.

The United States has in excess of 9,000 strategic nuclear weapons—contrasted to only 4,000 plus for the Soviets. The 9,000 strategic weapons are in addition to some 22,000 tactical nuclear weapons. Five thousand of these 9,000 strategic weapons are based on submarines and can be launched from submerged locations so that they are virtually invulnerable to attack. About half, or 2,500 of the sea launched ballistic weapons are always at sea.

The destructive capacity of these invulnerable submarines is shuddering to contemplate. Approximately 30 percent



of the Soviet population and 75 percent of Soviet industry are located in the 200 largest Russian cities. The capacity to destroy all those cities exists several times over in the invulnerable subs at sea. How much is enough?

Despite this awesome capacity, this supplemental appropriation pushes an escalation of new weapons—particularly the MX and the Pershing II.

The MX missile is a quantum jump in the arms race. The missile is being built supposedly because of alarms about the future vulnerability of U.S. ICBM's to preemptive Soviet attack. But, the MX is not just a mobile replacement for the Minuteman missile. It is a more accurate, more powerful, more dangerous weapon. The combination of these factors make it a silo killer—a war-fighting or first strike weapon. And, we might reflect that silo killers are not needed for empty silos.

There are questions about the actual vulnerability of our ICBM's. But there is no question that the Soviet Union has a more serious vulnerability problem than we do. Over two-thirds of Soviet strategic warheads are carried by ICBM's compared to 23 percent for U.S. ICBM's. I would raise this rather obvious question—if we cannot tolerate a threat to the relatively small number of warheads on our ICBM's, how could they tolerate the jeopardy of so much of their forces?

The MX force will threaten a disarming first strike against Soviet land missiles. This will require the Soviets to expand their forces, go mobile or fire on warning—thus either negating our MX force or raising the risk of war. The MX is destabilizing to world peace. This is true also for the Pershing II, the theater nuclear missile, that will give us the capacity to strike Russia from Europe.

Much of the rest of this budget supplemental is to buy the Shah's unwanted baubles, two ill-designed destroyers that are not constructed to our needs.

How much is enough? In this period of fiscal restraint, I urge your vote against the supplemental appropriation. It is unnecessary, but worse, it is dangerous.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, my basic position on this supplemental, as I stated in my dissenting views, is that we need this supplemental almost as much as a bull needs feathers. I think that if we really look at the whole history of this supplemental, we begin to see what is going on.

The President sent us his first supplemental. It had 40 items in it that were designated of "immediate and vital importance" that needed to be acted upon right away, that disappeared in the President's second supplemental. Forty "immediate and vital" items were lost or became less important between supplemental 1 and supplemental 2. Then we look at what is in this supplemental we are discussing today, and we find out that we have a large amount for ship building, we have a large amount for building claims. I commend the gentleman from Florida, chair of the Seapower Committee. He has had the patience of a saint

and done intensive oversight on shipbuilding claims. Some days I think we will never get rid of shipbuilding claims, but they are not that of such immediate urgency that we have to act on them right away in a supplemental. We have the Iranian destroyers that are in here, but they are not going to be finished between now and October 1 when we go into the new fiscal year. So why do we have to take action on them in this supplemental? In fact, I think the committee has agreed with an awful lot of what I am saying about this whole supplemental not being needed because the committee did a very good job on cutting \$2 billion worth of items out of the supplemental and getting it down now to \$1.4 billion.

As the Members know, the whip has scheduled next Friday for our next year's weapon's procurement bill. So if next week on June 8 we are going to be taking up the whole fiscal year 1980 budget; my question is, why, a week ahead of time, do we have to rush through this supplemental? I hate to say it, but I suspect it is a chance to get a few more cookies out of the jar before the lid is put on for this year. I just have real trouble seeing that any of these things have such immediate importance that we have to do it this week rather than next week. The maximum amount of time really is a matter of months, because we have to keep remembering the fiscal year is now no longer January 1 but is October 1. I have real problems with why we are dealing with this supplemental. I think it should be a part of the whole fiscal year 1980 budget. No case for urgency has been made. Rather it appears to just be a way to get a little more money in the pipeline before the spicket shuts off this year.

I will be offering amendments on the Iranian destroyers and to strike \$628 million that are to purchase those Iranian destroyers. I will speak to those amendments at the time that I offer that amendment and there is another amendment that will be offered that I will not be offering but would like to speak to. That is the Bedell amendment on the MPS system.

Regarding the whole MPS system—and once again we like to use jargon that nobody quite understands, for it makes it sound more mystical—there was a group of us who today toyed with trying to figure out how to graphically show Members what the MPS system is. We seriously toyed with buying 4,000 doughnuts and getting 200 pencils so we could move the pencils around from doughnut-hole to doughnut-hole and set this up outside to give members some idea of what this MPS system is all about. Thank goodness we did not do it because it is raining. MPS stands for 4,000 holes and 200 missiles. Granted, part of the reason we did not do this was because it would cost us \$400 to buy 4,000 doughnuts, and the space big enough to display them was the west front of the Capitol.

MPS is not necessarily new technology. We have known how to make holes since we have had squirrels. These are just hardened holes. We are going to have

4,000 holes and we are going to move 200 missiles around from hole to hole. Where are we going to put the holes? Many advocate the MPS system because it will make the Midwest a kind of sponge to soak up all the Soviet strategic weapons. The west coast and the east coast will be free. This is terrific if you live on the west coast or the east coast, but those of us who live in the designated sponge are not too keen on this whole system. It looks like the system will take up as much as 10,000 square miles. We have got to transport these things from hole to hole and if we do not do it on military bases, we will have to do it on roads and rails. I thought of offering an amendment to have each congressional district get 10 holes so we can share the honor of being a sponge for Soviet missiles. There are a lot of questions that need to be answered. I will be supporting amendments speaking to the MPS system.

The supplemental is locking us into the MPS system. I think we need to take a much harder look at other options before we buy it. Once again I am disclosing my prejudice because I live in a portion of the country being designated as the sponge.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield, reluctantly, 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DOWNEY).

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have a number of questions that possibly someone on the committee can answer for me. One deals with the AWACS. I notice that we are talking about eventually providing for a \$1.8 billion program for AWACS and that the U.S.-NATO share for this airplane, the plane in search of a mission, will be 41 percent. What concerns me is that the traditional share of the U.S. percentage for NATO equipment is usually 21 or 22 percent. I would like to know why we are providing 41 percent for the AWACS.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman will recall, that we have been negotiating with our allies for about 4 years on AWACS. There was some difficulty in convincing our NATO partners to assume their proportionate share of the burden. Another point I think that should be made is that the British are contributing Nimrod which has a lesser capability, and if we consider Nimrod as a part of this overall program, we find that our proportionate share drops to 33 percent, which in my judgment, while it is not completely equitable, is much better than we had several years ago.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can I ask the gentleman, who I know chaired the NATO subcommittee and in my opinion did a superb job in that committee, are we not really saying that in order to provide the capability that AWACS gives us in NATO, that we are going to have to give more money because our European allies

just do not want to spend the money? Is that not what it comes down to?

□ 1120

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Let me respond to the gentleman this way. If you had asked me that question a year ago my answer would have been "Yes." My judgment is that we have turned the corner and that our European allies do now believe the threat is greater than they originally thought. I have the feeling that from now on we are going to see an entirely different attitude on the part of our NATO allies.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL) in support of his amendment.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am proposing today is directed at title II of the bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee. The present language virtually "locks in" the committee's choice for a new basing mode for U.S. land-based missiles in a way that virtually assures its ultimate adoption. My amendment would simply say that this basing mode—the MPS, or multiple protective structures system—would first have to meet certain basic requirements of a replacement basing mode system, such as assuring the survivability of our land-based ICBM's more effectively than any other alternative, before full scale engineering development of MPS could begin.

The MPS system, as I am sure everyone is aware, would add more than 200 ICBM's to our land-based strategic force, but instead of fixed site deployment these missiles would be covertly shuttled among 4,000 or more silos—a "giant shell game" that would supposedly deter a Soviet first-strike attack. A variety of experts have raised serious reservations about the efficacy of the MPS system, however, and it is clear that this system, with a price tag ranging from \$25 to \$40 billion, should not go into full scale engineering development until several critical questions are answered satisfactorily.

Undoubtedly we all support the objective of assuring the survivability of our land-based ICBM force; I certainly do. However, I have strong objections to the way H.R. 2575 forces us into a premature commitment to a basing mode that from all appearances is a less-than-optimum approach to achieving that survivability objective.

Section 202 of H.R. 2575 as reported by the committee proclaims it to be the sense of Congress that—

the development of the MX missile, together with a new basing mode for such missile, would proceed so as to achieve initial operational capability (IOC) for both—at the earliest practicable date.

The section further directs the Secretary of Defense to—

proceed immediately with full scale engineering development of the missile basing mode known as the multiple protective structure (MPS) system concurrently with full scale development of the MX missile, unless and until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the Congress that an alternative basing mode is militarily or technologically superior to, and is more cost effective than,

the MPS system or the President informs the Congress that in his view the multiple protective structure (MPS) system is not consistent with United States national security interests. (Emphasis added.)

Mr. Chairman, this language is deceptive. While it may appear to be a relatively balanced directive to the President to move toward identification, development and deployment of a new basing mode and missile, it is in effect a total commitment to one basing mode—MPS—and one missile—MX.

Consider the conditions that must be met before the concurrent full scale engineering development of the MPS system with the MX missile can be interrupted. First, MPS development could be suspended if the Secretary of Defense were to certify to Congress "that an alternative basing mode is militarily or technologically superior to, and is more cost effective than, the MPS system." However, the committee has acted in a way that restricts R.D.T. & E. funding to only two basing mode options—MPS and the air mobile mode. It would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the Secretary to certify to Congress that the air mobile system is "militarily or technologically superior to" MPS. Testimony has indicated that the air mobile approach is vulnerable to many of the same criticisms that have been made against the existing air leg of the Triad.

Similarly, there is no reason to believe that the Secretary could certify to Congress that the air mobile system "is more cost effective" than the MPS system. In fact, the committee report states that—

An Air Mobile system has been studied by the Air Force and indications to date are that its cost would be 50 to 100 percent greater than the cost of the MPS system.

And further, Aerospace Daily quotes my distinguished colleague, Mr. ICHORN, chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee, as interpreting the Air Force report to be saying essentially that "the air-mobile system is out of the question."

The second condition for interruption of full-scale development of the MPS system stipulated in title II is that the President must inform Congress "that in his view the multiple protective structure (MPS) system is not consistent with U.S. national security interests." Political considerations make it unlikely that this will ever happen. Everyone is aware of the President's commitment to a new SALT Treaty. Recently, disclosures of verification difficulties have dimmed the prospects of Senate ratification of the SALT II agreement. The language contained in H.R. 2575, and language similar to it in the Senate, will put almost unbearable pressure on the President to abstain from a confrontation on the MPS mode in order to avoid alienating uncommitted Senators who are concerned about possible Soviet advantage.

In sum, title II would virtually preclude the selection of a basing mode other than the MPS approach.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that, at this juncture, such a commitment to MPS is ill-advised. Its endorsement ignores the potential of other alternatives and

downplays the key question of whether the system itself would make a positive contribution to our national security.

Serious objections have been raised to MPS including its dubious strategic value, high cost, incompatibility with arms control and verification objectives, adverse impact on the environment, and susceptibility to premature obsolescence. I believe that before the American people are asked to commit billions of dollars to, and put their dependence for strategic protection on, a particular strategic weapons policy, we in the Congress should be prepared to certify that it is the best known option. I am convinced that the MPS system does not meet such a test.

To begin with, MPS offers little assurance of providing the strategic security it is designed for. While MPS' stated objective is to lessen the chances of a Soviet counterforce attack by forcing them to target thousands of dispersed silos—thus expending the bulk of their warheads—there are a variety of realistic scenarios that point to the potential for total collapse of such a deterrent. My good friend BOB CARR, a member of the Armed Services Committee has done an excellent job of pointing out one of the major vulnerabilities of MPS: Essentially, it would be easier for the Soviets to proliferate more warheads to target our silos than it would be for us to build more dummy silos. If such a spiral were to reach its logical conclusion, the continental United States could look like a giant prairie dog town and we would be even less secure than before since the Soviets would have added thousands of more warheads to their arsenal. This argument points out the absolute necessity of ratifying a SALT Treaty if the United States were to adopt the MPS approach: Without the SALT prohibition against fractionating, or adding increased numbers of warheads to each side's missiles, the Soviets would be free to negate the MPS system by simply proliferating more warheads.

MPS has a variety of other strategic difficulties: if the Soviets were to follow suit by building their own MPS system—as they almost certainly would do—the "breakout" potential—that is, the likelihood that, in the event of a crisis, the Soviets would fill up the empty silos with weapons that were in storage—would increase enormously; MPS would be vulnerable to "pindown," which is a postulated Soviet ability to delay the response launching of U.S. land-based ICBM's for a period of hours simply by putting up a "barrage blanket" of warheads over the launching area; and, MPS would be very susceptible to premature obsolescence, since the Soviets could easily engineer a surveillance breakthrough that would allow them to distinguish between real and dummy missile.

A second major drawback associated with MPS is its cost. Estimates have ranged from \$19 to \$30 billion, and we all know that even the upper figure is probably conservative. In fact, it would appear that these cost estimates are significantly understated, since some elements of the MPS system such as the need for reinforced roads, and the de-



both countries. I might add that this is one of only three which are established by law in our country.

The first meeting was held in Guadalupe, Mexico, in 1961, and since then the annual meetings have alternated between the two countries.

The purpose of the conference, as expressed in U.S. law, is—and I quote—"for discussion of common problems in the interest of relations between the United States and Mexico."

The Members of the Senate participating, Mr. Speaker, were led by Senator LLOYD BENTSEN as chairman, and the delegation consisted of Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator BENNETT JOHNSTON, Senator DENNIS DECONCINI, Senator DAVID L. BOREN, Senator MAX BAUCUS, Senator DAVID PRYOR, Senator STROM THURMOND, and Senator HENRY BELLMON.

The Members of the House who attended, accompanied by "yours truly" as cochairmen, were led by our distinguished majority leader, JIM WRIGHT. Our colleague from Pennsylvania, GUS YATRON, was vice chairman, and then also attending were Congressmen VAN DEERLIN, KAZEN, GEORGE MILLER of California, COELHO, KOGOVSEK, ROUSSELOT, LAGOMARSINO, RUDD, and GILMAN of New York.

The Mexican delegation, Mr. Speaker, was led by the head of the majority in their House of Representatives, Deputy Rodolfo Gonzalez Guevara, and the Senate was lead by Senator Jesus Cabrera Munoz Ledo.

I will supply for the RECORD the other participants on the Mexican side. The list of participants is as follows:

#### SENATORS

Jesus Cabrera Munoz Ledo.  
Gilberto Ruiz Almada.  
Antonio Ocampo Ramirez.  
Javier Rondero Zubieta.  
Rosa Ma. Martinez Denegri.  
Rodolfo Alavez Flores.  
Daniel Espinoza Galindo.  
Nicolas Reynes Berezaluze.  
Silverio R. Alvarado.  
Adolfo de la Huerta Oriol.  
Silverio R. Alvarado.  
Hector Hugo Olivares Ventura.  
Telesforo Trejo Uribe.  
Joaquin E. Repetto Ocampo.  
Celestino Salcedo Monteon.

#### CONGRESSMEN

Rodolfo Gonzalez Guevara.  
Antonio Riva Palacio.  
Enrique Alvarez Del Castillo.  
Armando Labra Manjarrez.  
Hugo Castro Aranda.  
Pericles Namorado Urrutia.  
Gloria Carrillo Salinas.  
Alfredo Carrillo Juarez.  
Patricio Robles Robles.  
Pastor Murgia Gonzalez.  
Sergio Lujambio Rafols.  
Marcela Lombardo de Gutierrez.  
Pedro Gonzalez Azcoaga.

Senator Joaquin Bamboa Pascoe, majority leader of the Mexican Senate delegated his duties to Senator Jesus Cabrera Munoz Ledo.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, aside from the meetings and the agenda which had been previously agreed to, we participated in a brief moment at least in the making of Mexican history. As the head of the House of Representatives, Deputy Rodolfo Gonzalez Guevara, while we

were there, was appointed by the President or named by the President to be Undersecretary of Gobernacion, which is a very important cabinet position in Mexico. He was then succeeded by Deputy Antonio Riva Palacio, who replaced him. All this happened during our deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include the agenda for the parliamentary meeting between the United States and Mexico, as follows:

#### AGENDA FOR THE XIX PARLIAMENTARY MEETING BETWEEN MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

##### I—POLITICAL AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE

(Sen. Lloyd M. Bentsen—Diputado Enrique Alvarez del Castillo.)

1. Relations between United States and Mexico.
2. Documented and Undocumented Workers and Human Rights.
3. Cultural Exchange (Report by Mexican Delegation) and Scientific and Technological Cooperation.
4. Cooperation to Control the Traffic and Consumption of Drugs.
5. Law of the Sea.
6. Pollution (Tijuana, Ciudad Juarez, N. Laredo) (Border Region).

##### II—ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

(Sen. Jesus Cabrera Munoz Ledo—Rep. E. de la Garza.)

1. Commercial Relations.
  - (a) Bilateral and Multilateral Trade Agreements.
  - (b) Systems of Preferences.
  - (c) Conventions, Agreements and Measures concerning:
    - (1) Textile and Synthetic Fibers.
    - (2) Tomatoes.
    - (3) Fruits.
    - (4) Steel.
    - (5) Others.
2. Economy of the Frontier.
3. Agricultural Cooperation.
  - (a) Mediterranean fruit fly.
  - (b) Coffee Rola.
  - (c) Hoof and Mouth Disease.
  - (d) Citrus black fly.
  - (e) Screw worm fly.
4. Tourism.
5. Fishing Agreements.
6. Energy.

Mr. Speaker, I will supply for the RECORD as well a joint communique which was agreed to by both countries in the final session. That communique is as follows:

#### JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF THE NINETEENTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The Nineteenth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference was held in Mexico City on May 25-26, 1979.

As on previous occasions, this year's interparliamentary meeting served to broaden understanding of the economic, political, and social relations between the two countries and produced suggested solutions, subject to their respective constitutional processes which will unquestionably be a factor in improving relations between Mexico and the United States.

From the beginning, these interparliamentary meetings have focussed on trade relations, investment, migratory problems, and border transactions—topics which are of the utmost importance, requiring a systematic analysis by the legislators and reflecting the disparity between the development levels of the two countries. These meetings have contributed to the resolution of problems such as the Chamizal dispute; the conflict over the salinity of the Colorado River; and the considerable progress being made in combatting drug traffic. Following the conference held

last year, the United States increased the customs exemptions for purchases acquired in Mexico by U.S. tourists from 100 to 300 dollars.

On energy, we agreed it would be a serious mistake for anyone to infer that Mexico is somehow the answer to all of the United States energy problems. It was recognized that Mexico has its own high priority domestic needs and, as its economy grows and expands, Mexico must look first to its own requirements. It is understood that the Government of Mexico will determine how and at what pace its energy resources will be developed and that is the decision of Mexico alone. For the United States part, it would expect to compete with the rest of the world on an equal basis for any excess Mexican energy.

On the topic of undocumented workers, it was agreed that the human rights of all people, regardless of their legal status, are inviolate and neither the United States nor Mexico will tolerate abuse of their citizens. We welcome the willingness of our respective governments as reflected in the February 16 Joint Presidential Communique, to cooperate in the resolution of the problem. It was further agreed that the issue of undocumented workers seeking to enter the United States will cease to be an issue only when there is less disparity of economic opportunity between our two nations.

The Mexican Delegation fully recognized the interest shown by the United States Congress in the study of this problem in the appropriate committees. Both parties agreed to study the legal problems concerning material witnesses in pending legal proceedings, and the analysis of immigration quotas in practice.

Both delegations recognize the long-term importance of increasing Mexico's access to U.S. markets and note the progress which has been achieved in the past decade, when the value of Mexican goods entering the United States duty-free increased from \$272 million to over \$1.5 billion and the total value of Mexican exports to the United States increased from \$600 million to \$6 billion, with a high proportion in manufactured goods. It was agreed that the increase in bilateral trade and the diversification of Mexican products marketed in the United States is a welcome development and a goal to be pursued by both countries.

On the subject of cultural and technological exchanges there was a general consensus the results achieved to date left some room for improvement. The delegations consequently expressed the hope that progress would continue to be made in the direction of increasingly close cooperation. The participants also coincided in their views on the need to increase the tourist flow in both directions by removing all obstacles to such activity. In addition they agreed to increase their efforts to combat environmental pollution and to provide ecological protection to the common border area.

Both delegations noted the progress achieved in the struggle against the cultivation and trafficking of drugs and commended Mexico's drug control and eradication program, while recognizing the valuable cooperation of the United States. The delegations noted that it was urgently important for such cooperation to continue on a similar level and for the United States to make a vigorous effort, by means of education and health programs, to eliminate the demand for drugs, especially among young people.

It was also decided that the two delegations would intensify the exchange of information and continue the work of the parliamentary group referred to in the Declaration of Hermosillo. This would promote the activities of the Subcommittee with regard to the Consultative Mechanism formulated by the Presidents of Mexico and the United States in 1977.

The diverse programs for cooperation in the field of agriculture were also examined and both delegations expressed their satisfaction with the results achieved.

In regard to fishing, the delegates approved the policy of the Government of Mexico concerning agreement on joint investment to support the development of the fishing industry.

The United States delegation expressed its gratitude to the Mexican Congress for the support it had provided in holding this Conference.

In addition both delegations expressed their satisfaction with the progress achieved toward common goals during the visit of President Carter last February and reiterated their hopes that both Presidents would pursue these objectives to an even greater extent during their next meeting.

Both delegations agreed that the debates had been carried out in an atmosphere of close friendship and with a desire to collaborate under just and equitable conditions, in order to improve the relations between Mexico and the United States. They also reaffirmed points of agreement, while defining their differences with the understanding that honest scrutiny would produce greater benefits for both countries in the future.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the meeting, as it concerned both countries, was on the highest order. As always, we were received in Mexico with a high degree of respect and cordiality. The meetings were very frank, and they were very fruitful. We were impressed by the frankness of Members in discussing items such as energy and items such as the undocumented workers and trade relations between the two countries.

We were honored to be received by the President of Mexico, the Honorable Jose Lopez Portillo, who expressed the sentiments so often heard from him at all times, that we are neighbors, that we are friends, and that all differences, if any occur—and there are some—can be resolved in the spirit of friendship and in the spirit of conviviality between the two countries.

I think perhaps this was one of the best, if not the best meeting, that I have attended, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to pay special tribute to my colleagues from the House particularly, for the preparation and for the work which went into their participation in the debate and for the invaluable assistance they gave me as the chairman. I pay tribute to them for their participation in these most vital discussions affecting our two countries. I also wish to thank our Ambassador Patrick Lacey for his assistance, and that of the Embassy during our stay. I think this was one of the best meetings we have ever had.

I came back from Mexico, Mr. Speaker, with the feeling that not everything is well between our two countries, as is the case with every other country in the world, but that every problem is being heard at the highest level of consultation and being treated in a frank and direct yet cordial manner. We remain the best of friends.

The Members have, and especially those of us who live on the border, have had relations with the government and with the government officials in Mexico and are satisfied that the interests and the dedication of the Mexican Government, and in this case of the Members of their Congress, are such that they want

very much to express to us their sentiments, their personal sentiments of friendship and those of their government.

I think that keeping that discussion on the level that we experienced will assure us that we will be able to, as we have in the past, resolve some of the thorny issues in our history, and that we will be able to resolve and will be capable of resolving any other problems in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I will later ask other Members of the delegation to engage with me in another special order, but I have taken this special order today in order to facilitate the preparation of our report to the Speaker and to the House of Representatives.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA) and Senator LLOYD BENTSEN of Texas for their distinguished leadership as chairmen of the delegation from the Congress to the XIX Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico City on May 24–29, 1979.

As a delegate to this conference, I found our discussions with our Mexican colleagues to be frank and fruitful as we reviewed our mutual problems involving energy, undocumented workers, trade, cultural and technological exchanges, agricultural cooperation, and tourism.

I was particularly concerned with our discussions on narcotics cultivation and trafficking and the Law of the Sea negotiations. I was pleased that our Mexican colleagues were in agreement to continue their cooperation and successful efforts in eradicating the Mexican opium crops, the reaffirmation of the Declaration of Hermosillo, and their promotion of the implementation of a joint parliamentary consultative mechanism on narcotics.

With regard to the Law of the Sea negotiations, both delegations shared optimism for the eventual culmination of an international treaty regulating the common heritage of the seas.

The discussions of this 19th parliamentary conference have added to the further understanding between Mexico and the United States. And it is hoped there will be many additional exchanges of this nature in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share my views with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD, I request that the text of my remarks on narcotics and on the Law of the Sea Treaty, delivered at the 19th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, be printed in full:

#### PROGRESS TOWARD A LAW OF THE SEA TREATY

I welcome this opportunity to talk with my parliamentary colleagues about the third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea. This Conference is perhaps the most important multilateral negotiation of our time. Our government has a great interest in these negotiations. We are committed to achieving an international agreement on rules that can govern the use of over 70% of the earth's surface. While serving my third term as a Congressional Advisor to the U.S. delegation to the Conference, I recently spent several days in Geneva participating in the meetings of the Eighth Session. Permit me to share with you several observations about that session.

First, I believe that some real progress was made in Geneva on provisions dealing with the protection of the marine environment, on the rights of land-locked states, and on portions of the seabeds regime. I appreciate the highly constructive role that the Mexican delegation has played particularly in the work of Committees II and III of the Conference. I was delighted to hear that your very able and highly esteemed Ambassador to the Conference, Mr. Castaneda, has recently been appointed the Foreign Minister of Mexico. This is a very important and demanding position. I hope that Mr. Castaneda will still be able to contribute his considerable expertise to the on-going negotiations on the Law of the Sea.

Second, as a result of the work in Geneva, there now seems to be a real possibility of reaching an agreement on a treaty; but several major issues have yet to be resolved—the outer limits of the continental shelf, marine science and various provisions on the seabed text. We should try to resolve these issues as soon as possible. As a member of Congress where seabed mining legislation has been reintroduced I consider it essential to settle the seabeds matter with due dispatch. The legislation I refer to would provide companies in the United States with an interim legal framework to mine nodules on the seafloor pending the coming into force of an international treaty. Last year the House passed a seabed mining bill and the Senate almost passed the legislation. This year's bill is similar to last year's bill and the Senate and House Committees of jurisdiction have already begun to act. As I talk with you today, the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives are holding hearings. They plan to report their views on the legislation early in June. Two weeks ago, the Senate Energy Committee unanimously approved the seabed bill. I expect the entire Congress will enact legislation this year and send it to the President for his signature.

I am aware that the Mexican Government and the Government of the United States hold different views on this legislation. The United States continues to maintain that seabed mining is an exercise of freedom of the high seas under the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas. We also maintain that the Declaration of Principles, adopted by resolution of the General Assembly in 1970 is not legally binding nor has the force of law. This is consistent with our position that United Nations resolutions are not legally binding. Your Government and others believe that the 1970 Declaration of Principles is legally binding and that seabed mining legislation, if enacted, would contravene those Principles. I earnestly hope that the seabeds issue can be resolved in New York this summer when the 9th session resumes negotiations.

Let me say a word about another important issue of the Law of Seas Conference—dispute settlement. International machinery for dispute settlement is essential to the fair application of various provisions of a Law of the Sea Treaty and I am gratified to learn about the recent progress that has been made in this area of the negotiations. I understand that both Mexico and the United States have certain reservations about the Statute of the International Court of Justice. That is, we do not automatically accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. Yet the arrangements for settling disputes between ourselves are somewhat limited in scope. The International Joint Commission is the major mechanism available for discussing differences. We need to think about improving this machinery so that we can deal with other problems of mutual concern to our countries, such as fisheries disputes, business practices of U.S. firms in



Mexico, and the treatment of Mexican workers in the U.S.

I would like to make a proposal for the consideration of my colleagues—that we create a working group of U.S.-Mexican Parliamentarians to study the possibility of establishing international dispute settlement machinery to resolve disagreements in the area I have mentioned. Such a working group could be made up of members of the Mexican and American Bar Associations.

In fact, there is a precedent for such a group; the Canadian and American Bar Associations having respectively appointed members to a joint working group on dispute settlements. Such a working group could be appointed from among interested American and Mexican parliamentarians. I would welcome your views on this matter.

#### DRUG CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, distinguished legislators from Mexico and the United States, I welcome this opportunity to once again participate in these annual bilateral conferences and to join our colleagues from Mexico in the deliberations of the 19th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, and to discuss with this committee the critical issue of narcotics trafficking.

Two years ago, when this bilateral conference met in Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico, I presented a paper that comprehensively discussed the joint efforts of our two nations to interdict narcotics trafficking and to eradicate the illicit production of drugs at its source. Through the efforts of my Mexican colleagues, the distinguished Deputies Enrique Ramirez y Ramirez and Victor Manzanilla Schaffer and my colleague from Texas, the distinguished Chairman of the House delegation to this interparliamentary conference, Mr. de la Garza, the delegations from both our nations enthusiastically responded by adopting the Declaration of Hermosillo on Narcotics Trafficking at the International level.

The Hermosillo Declaration "condemns without reservations of any kind, the illegal cultivation of all plants that may be used to obtain substances which, when employed in narcotics, cause grave and often irreparable damage to the people's health."

The declaration further states that—

"It is the responsibility of the public institutions and competent authorities of our nations to become deeply involved, reinforce and extend to the utmost the fight against cultivation, traffic, use and abuse of drugs, and to this end adopt all the legislative, judicial, political and economic measures that will lead to the eradication of this far-reaching problem."

Encouraged by my colleagues from Mexico and the United States, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 265, which was sponsored by the House delegation attending the Hermosillo Conference, including members of this year's delegation, the distinguished Majority Leader, Mr. Wright, Mr. de la Garza, and my distinguished colleagues from California, Mr. Rousselot and Mr. Lagomarsino.

H. Con. Res. 265, unanimously passed by the House of Representatives on October 31st, 1977, and the Senate on July 18, 1978, called upon the Congress of the United States to endorse the Hermosillo Declaration and encouraged other nations to adopt this Declaration. It urged the President of the United States to encourage other nations to cooperate in an international effort to eradicate narcotics trafficking and to eliminate the illicit production of opium.

Last month, as a member of the U.S. Congressional delegation that attended the 15th interparliamentary meeting between Members of Congress and Members of the European Parliament, I had the opportunity to address my European colleagues regarding

the problems of drug abuse prevention and control and to urge the European Community to wage a concerted "war" on narcotics. While attending that meeting, I was delighted to learn that my good friend and colleague, Victor Manzanilla Schaffer, President of the Latin American Parliament and co-chairman of the Fourth European Parliament/Latin American Parliament Interparliamentary Conference that was held in Rome in February of this year, prepared a set of conclusions pertaining to drug abuse and drug trafficking that was approved by the conference and incorporated into its Final Act.

Under his leadership, the conference agreed to call upon the Parliaments of the countries represented to:

(1) "Lend their utmost support to all the measures taken by the governments of their respective countries to restrain the illegal production, distribution and consumption of narcotics and drugs which induce harmful dependence;

(2) "Cooperate closely with the administrative authorities of their respective countries with a view to eradicating this great evil through joint action in the field of education and social and penal legislation;

(3) "Promote a large-scale information campaign to awaken public opinion to the dangers of drug abuse;

(4) "Urge the countries of Latin America and Europe to make a greater contribution to the actions undertaken by the United Nations and its specialized agencies, while drawing attention however, to the danger of a harmful proliferation of organizations for combatting drug abuse and drug traffic;

(5) "Set up a joint working party to study this serious problem, using in particular the documents presented during the sitting by the delegations from Colombia, Costa Rica and Mexico, and to report to the next Interparliamentary Conference on the laws in force in each Member State, on the measures which governments are taking to control the traffic and abuse of drugs on the underlying causes, particularly economic and social causes of these disastrous phenomena; with this aim the Conference will furnish the necessary instructions to the Secretaries of the European Parliament and the Latin American Parliament;

(6) "Report to the Parliaments and Governments of the countries represented at the Conference on these agreements;

(7) "Forward a copy of this declaration to the Secretary-General of the United Nations Organization, the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, the Director of the World Health Organization and to the Council and the Commission of the European Communities."

Mr. Chairman, the Hermosillo Declaration, House Concurrent Resolution 265, and the conclusions adopted by the Fourth European-Latin American Interparliamentary Conference are important policy objectives, but we, as legislators and policy makers in our respective congresses, must do more than issue well-intentioned declarations and resolutions. We must translate these lofty declarations and resolutions into constructive action.

Mr. Chairman, two myths constantly cloud the relations between our great nations. First, that the United States is perceived by some of our Latin American neighbors as the "Colossus of the North" and second, that there is a distinction between heroin producer nations and heroin user nations.

Politically, economically, socially, militarily, nations live in an interdependent world, and this is particularly true for our two nations that share a common 2,000-mile border that meshes the health and well-being of our citizens in this area into a common culture and interdependent economy. The so-called "Colossus of the North," an

anachronism from another era, no longer exists. We certainly do not perceive ourselves in this manner and hopefully our Mexican colleagues do not perceive us in this manner. We also hope that we are no longer perceived as the "gringo," but as friends and neighbors who must help one another. We not only share a common border but also common problems. Many of our citizens speak the same language and possess the same cultural heritage. We, in the United States, must be more sensitive to your needs and aspirations. We also need your assistance in overcoming our shared problems. We must help one another in reducing the unacceptably high levels of inflation, unemployment and poverty, in curbing population explosions, in resolving problems pertaining to undocumented aliens, oil and natural gas exploration, marketing and sales obstacles, trade and tariff problems, in interdicting narcotics trafficking and in eradicating the illicit supply of drug production at its source, in treating and rehabilitating the victims of drug abuse, and in curbing the smuggled contraband and the illicit financial transactions across our joint border.

Each year an estimated one billion dollars worth of American goods are smuggled into Mexico, thereby depriving the Mexican economy of millions of dollars in uncollected taxes and contributing to the disruption of certain Mexican industries and to unacceptably high levels of unemployment in that nation. In this regard, Mexico's National Chamber of Electronics Manufacturers estimates that 40 percent of Mexico's electronic goods come from contraband. Falsified papers pass customs inspection and corruption of officials contribute to these smuggling operations. Ignacio Madrazo, Mexico's National Director of Customs, has reportedly stated:

"It is obviously in the interest of both countries. The more contraband that comes in, the less jobs there are in Mexico and the more Mexicans will go illegally to the U.S. The problems are completely intertwined. It doesn't take an expert or a political sophisticate to figure that out."

Rather than being insensitive to your needs and to your accomplishments, both our great nations should view one another as we really are: compadres, helping one another to resolve difficult political, economic and social problems that affect the health and welfare of our citizens. We need to promote the abrazo in our relationship, rather than the stiff, diplomatic handshake.

The second myth that clouds our relationship is the view expressed in some quarters that heroin producer nations can point an accusatory finger at the heroin user nation as the cause for the existing drug problems that plague our nations.

Drug addiction and drug dependency have reached epidemic proportions throughout the world. The United Nations International Narcotics Control Board has reported:

"Seizures and government estimates of the size of addict populations in Burma, Thailand, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Singapore show that the area is a major consumer of its own illegal opium products. Nevertheless sufficient opiates are produced to support a world-wide traffic with an increased impact."

Thailand, a major heroin producer nation, reports a drug addiction population estimated between 300,000 and 600,000. In Burma, another key nation in the production of illicit opium from the Golden Triangle, 20,000 individuals are registered in narcotics treatment centers, which international health officials state is many times higher than the registered figures. Iran reports an estimated 400,000 addicts, and I understand that Mexico has approximately 50,000 drug abusers.

Egyptian law enforcement authorities have informed me that that nation's 500,000 drug abusers consume an estimated 3 to 6 tons of opium annually and that the cultivation of poppy fields in that nation has reached such grave proportions that "there is a possibility that Egypt might become an illicit opium producing nation." In the United States approximately 450,000 heroin addicts . . . a decline from approximately 700,000 that were estimated several years ago . . . reportedly spend \$6 billion annually to support their habit.

Mr. Chairman, this data is only the tip of the iceberg. It does not account for the unknown number of individuals who are not reported as drug addicts. It does not include those who are not registered in drug treatment centers or who are psychologically and physically dependent upon amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers or who are cross-addicted by pills and alcohol. The data does, however, indicate what we all know: namely, that illicit drug trafficking is a multibillion dollar industry controlled by international criminal syndicates and independent merchants . . . an industry whose annual sales just in the United States alone are estimated to exceed \$45 billion. This places this sordid business third in annual sales after General Motors (\$54.9 billion) and Exxon (\$54.1 billion) but ahead of the Ford Motor Company (\$37.8 billion).

Obviously, global trafficking in illicit drugs far exceeds \$45 billion. Canadian law enforcement authorities state that heroin trafficking alone represents the fifth largest industry in British Columbia, grossing at least \$255 million a year and requiring over 365 pounds of smuggled heroin to supply Vancouver's addict population. From the Golden Triangle of Thailand, Burma and Laos, to Iran and Egypt, from Afghanistan and Pakistan to West Europe, from Colombia, Mexico and the Caribbean to the narcotics distribution centers of Berlin, Frankfurt, Brussels, Stockholm, Hong Kong, Hawaii, Nassau, Miami, New York, Chicago and Vancouver, nation after nation are reporting increased usage and illicit trafficking of marijuana, cocaine, hashish, heroin and other dangerous drugs among its citizens. The international drug syndicates are highly organized, well-financed and have sophisticated operations. Their corrupt tentacles reach into every facet of a nation's society, corrupting public officials and private citizens, undermining the administration of justice and eventually destroying the decency, moral values and very roots of that society. Professional people, law enforcement officials and businessmen have also been involved in the illicit manufacture, distribution and dispensing of illicit drugs.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that we live in an interdependent world. Drug abuse prevention and control affect citizens throughout the world, regardless of the nation's political, economic or social system. Drug abuse problems transcend international boundaries. Citizens afflicted with drug addiction and the international narcotics traffickers, who reap unknown billions of dollars from this human misery, do not distinguish between heroin producer nations and heroin user nations. With regard to drug abuse prevention and control, the laws of supply and demand are inexorably intertwined. As we stated in the Hermosillo Declaration: "Heroin and other harmful drugs do not respect boundaries and attack or threaten to a greater or lesser degree every nation and especially the youth of all countries."

Mr. Chairman, last November, as a member of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control and as a member of the U.S.-Mexico Consultative Mechanism, along with my colleague from New York, Mr. Wolff, the distinguished Chairman of the

Narcotics Select Committee and a member of the Consultative Mechanism, I visited Mexico, where we had the opportunity to participate in helicopter spraying operations in remote mountainous regions northeast of Culiacan. I was deeply impressed by the skill, dedication, and expertise of the pilots and the troops we spoke to at the military front-line posts. We also had the opportunity to discuss the complex problem of narcotics trafficking with Attorney General Oscar Flores Sanchez, the Secretary of Foreign Relations, Santiago Roel Garcia, the President of the Grand Commission of the Chamber of Deputies, Rudolfo Gonzalez Guevara, the President of the Grand Commission of the Chamber of Senators, Senator Joaquin Gamboa Pascoe, and their distinguished colleagues. Last month, the distinguished Deputy Antonio Riva Palacio, Secretary of the Grand Commission of the Chamber of Deputies and President of the Subcommittee on Narcotics, took time from his busy schedule to visit me and Congressman Wolff when he was in Washington, where we had the opportunity to discuss the Consultative Mechanism and other important issues relating to drug abuse prevention and control.

The cooperation between our two nations in interdicting narcotics trafficking and in eradicating the illicit production of opium at its source has paid off in substantial dividends. Two years ago approximately 80 percent of the heroin being sold on the streets of the United States originated from Mexico. Today that figure has been reduced to approximately 60 percent.

Last year, Mexican law enforcement officials destroyed 3,915 acres of opium producing poppies, which if harvested would have produced 3,400 pounds of pure heroin at an estimated street value exceeding 2.5 billion dollars (at a 100 percent purity level). Through joint, cooperative efforts between the Mexican federal police, together with their colleagues from our Drug Enforcement Administration, the Federales seized 203 pounds of cocaine, 428,508 pounds of marijuana, 203 pounds of heroin, 8,240 pounds of hashish, which, if sold in the United States, would have amounted to approximately \$60 million in cocaine, \$155 million in marijuana, \$201 million in heroin, and \$36 million in hashish.

Marijuana trafficking from Colombia has surpassed Mexico as the prime supplier of this drug to the United States, thereby illustrating the changing patterns of narcotics trafficking by organized crime and demonstrating the progress that has been achieved by Mexico and the United States in helping each other to interdict marijuana and to eradicate it at its source.

But the "war" on drug abuse and drug trafficking is far from over. Much work in intensifying the cooperation between our two nations remains.

Since January of 1976, Congressman Wolff and I have urged the implementation of a joint anti-narcotics commission . . . a commission that was approved by Presidents Echeverria, Lopez-Portillo, Ford and Carter, and is part of the United States-Mexico Consultative Mechanism. When President Carter visited President Lopez-Portillo last February, the joint communique issued at the conclusion of President Carter's visit stated that both Presidents "decided to strengthen the mechanism and provide it with more dynamism, cohesion and flexibility for its more effective operation."

The Consultative Mechanism has been operationalized. Some of the subgroups of that mechanism have met. Yet after much urging by Congressman Wolff and myself, the Anti-narcotics Subgroup has yet to hold its first meeting, let alone perform its vitally important task in a "dynamic, cohesive, flexible and effective" manner that was stated in the Lopez-Portillo-Carter joint communique.

I recently learned that the Consultative Mechanism that was established in February 1979, following the conversations between Presidents Lopez-Portillo and Carter, does not include a consultative mechanism on narcotics between parliamentarians and that the anti-narcotics consultations have been folded into a segment of the mechanism pertaining to law enforcement at the executive level, all of which leads to a void in the implementation of the efforts by our two governments to develop a mechanism in which legislators and executive officials can jointly focus attention on a problem that vitally affects the health and well-being of all our citizens. In discussing the status of the consultative mechanism with our parliamentarian colleagues from Mexico and with high ranking members of the Lopez-Portillo Administration, we have been assured of their cooperation and that we are on the right track, and yet somewhere along the way the Anti-narcotics Consultative Mechanism has been sidetracked. If we are going to win the "war" on drug abuse, then we must certainly act with greater dispatch in putting together a joint committee.

We must do more than pass well-intentioned declarations and resolutions. The time to act is upon us. We must cut through the bureaucracy of our respective nations to continue our anti-narcotics efforts by implementing the letter and the spirit of the Hermosillo Declaration and the conclusions established by the Fourth European-Latin American Interparliamentary Conference. We must also establish and operationalize the Anti-narcotics Consultative Mechanism and continue our joint efforts at eradicating the illicit production of drugs at its source. We must maintain a constant vigil over the illicit production of opium, marijuana and other dangerous drugs by eradicating these substances at their source and by interdicting illicit drug trafficking. Mexico is fast becoming a transshipment state for cocaine trafficking, thereby requiring our nations to intensify our joint, cooperative efforts to prevent this illicit traffic pattern from reaching epidemic proportions.

I would also urge the Government of Mexico to help the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC) by contributing to the Fund and by using its immense prestige to encourage other nations in the Western Hemisphere to contribute to UNFDAC. Last year, only 4 Latin American nations (Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Venezuela) contributed a meager \$17,000 to the Fund, whose budget depends upon voluntary public and private contributions. This \$17,000 represented less than 3 percent of the Fund's \$7.2 million budget for 1978. Surely, our Latin America neighbors can do better than this in the "global war" against drug abuse . . . a plague that adversely affects all our citizens.

The "war" on drug abuse and the international narcotics traffickers is a never-ending task . . . it is a herculean problem. Through the joint, cooperative efforts of our two great nations, we are succeeding in winning this "war" by raising the consciousness of the public regarding the dangers of drug abuse and by forcing the international drug peddlers to shift their drug trafficking patterns.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleagues in the drug abuse field, I want to thank the people of Mexico and its distinguished President for their cooperation in assisting us in trying to stem the tide against the corrupt influence of organized crime and the narcotics peddlers of human destruction that affect both our nations. I also want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for providing me this opportunity to share with you and this distinguished committee my thoughts concerning this vitally important issue.



□ 1740

## INTRODUCTION OF DIESEL SUPPLY SAFEGUARD ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the shortage of diesel fuel threatening agricultural production is not a parochial problem only affecting the Nation's farmers, it is a national problem affecting every American directly or indirectly. Higher food prices, depleted city supermarket shelves, and a larger balance-of-payments deficit aggravating inflation are among the national consequences of a shortage of diesel fuel for agriculture.

Severely compounding the current shortage of diesel fuel is the decision of major oil companies to withdraw from a long-established marketing area. The abandonment of local diesel fuel dealers and their customers by the major oil companies and the disruption in supply of essential diesel fuel which abandonment causes has not received adequate attention.

Local diesel fuel dealers in South Dakota who have been notified they are being abandoned by their fuel supplier report they are unable to find a comparable source of supply. These local businessmen have said they need protection from oil company abandonment for their customers whose ability to make a living depends on being able to obtain diesel fuel. They believe the disruption of essential diesel fuel supplies in South Dakota and elsewhere will increase if oil company plans to abandon local diesel fuel dealers go unchecked.

An oil company decision to abandon a local diesel fuel dealer and the dealer's customers can be made and proceed without any regard or consideration of the local consequences. This serious imbalance needs to be corrected.

I am today introducing legislation to correct this imbalance. The legislation I am introducing, the Diesel Supply Safeguard Act, provides a needed measure of protection for local diesel fuel dealers and their customers. Under the Diesel Supply Safeguard Act an oil company decision to abandon a local diesel fuel dealer could be postponed until the local dealer could secure another source of supply under terms and conditions no less favorable. In addition, the decision to seek a postponement of a planned oil company abandonment would be made locally, not by a Federal or State government official.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the Diesel Supply Safeguard Act in the RECORD.

H.R. 4263

A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act to prevent the termination of franchises for the retail distribution of diesel fuel in certain cases in which a substantial portion of the diesel fuel is sold for agricultural or other essential uses

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Diesel Supply Safeguard Act."

SEC. 2. Section 102(b) (2) (E) and (3) (D) of the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 2802(b) (2) (E) and (3) (D)), relating to grounds for termination or nonrenewal of gasoline dealer franchises, are each amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (ii);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (iii); and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(iv) in the case of any franchise under which the franchisor is required to supply diesel fuel to a franchisee who, in the regular course of business, engages in the sale, consignment, or distribution of that diesel fuel for agricultural or any other essential use—

"(I) the franchisee is able, upon the exercise of reasonable good faith efforts, to obtain diesel fuel and gasoline motor fuel from another source or sources under terms and conditions no less favorable than would be available if the franchise relationship involved continued; or

"(II) the franchisor is unable to meet the motor fuel supply requirements involved due to circumstances beyond the control of the franchisor, or any affiliate of the franchisor."

SEC. 3. Section 105(e) (2) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2805(e)), relating to limitation on judicially ordered continuations and renewals of franchise relationships, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of paragraph (1) shall not apply in the case of any franchise under which the franchisor is required to supply diesel fuel to a franchisee who sells, consigns, or distributes that diesel fuel in significant quantities for agricultural, commercial, or any other essential use, unless—

"(A) the franchisee is able, upon the exercise of reasonable good faith efforts, to obtain diesel fuel and gasoline motor fuel from another source or sources under terms and conditions no less favorable than would be available if the franchise relationship involved continued; or

"(B) the franchisor is unable to meet the motor fuel supply requirements involved due to circumstances beyond the control of the franchisor, or any affiliate of the franchisor."

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME TO HOLD HEARINGS ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings for June 6 and 11, 1979. The hearings will begin on June 6 at 9:30 a.m., in room 2226, Rayburn House Office Building, and at 10 a.m. on June 11, in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building.

Among the bills to be considered at these hearings are H.R. 4051, reflecting proposals for amendment submitted by the Judicial Conference of the United States, and H.R. 3630, containing the recommendations for amendment prepared by the Department of Justice. Persons invited to present testimony on

this legislation include Hon. John Feikens, U.S. district court judge from Detroit, Mich.; Hon. Robert Fiske, Jr., U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York; U.S. Attorney General Griffin Bell; and Prof. Richard S. Frase, University of Minnesota Law School.

Individuals wishing to testify or submit a statement for the record should address their requests to the Subcommittee on Crime, House Committee on the Judiciary, 207E Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.●

## MILWAUKEE RAILROAD IN SERIOUS JEOPARDY OF GOING BANKRUPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a major railroad in America is in serious jeopardy of going bankrupt. As many Members of this House are aware, that line is the Milwaukee Road.

Within a few days, legislation will be before this House which will help to save the Pacific coast extension of that railroad. That legislation will delay abandonment of the line for 45 days, plus require the Secretary of Energy to immediately assess the impact upon America's energy problems which would occur if the Milwaukee were to abandon the extension which serves the area containing one-half of America's strippable coal.

Montanans and people throughout the Pacific Northwest are obviously very concerned with this matter. That, of course, includes Milwaukee employees as well as shippers who rely on the Milwaukee to transport their products.

I am submitting for the RECORD telegrams which have been received from shippers throughout Montana encouraging the continuation of the Milwaukee Road:

BUTTE, MONT., May 17, 1979.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Re Milwaukee Railroad Western Energy Company and Montana Power Company believe that a workable plan involving employee and shipper ownership of the Milwaukee Railroad can be developed. We are interested in pursuing such a plan. We believe that the plan will result in the continued operation of the Milwaukee Railroad, which is essential to the economy of our area and for transportation of coal to serve the energy objectives of this Nation.

W. P. SCHMECHSEL,  
President, Western Energy Co., and President, the Montana Power Co.

MADISON, WIS.

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Wisconsin Power and Light Company, a large user of the Milwaukee Road, is interested in exploring possibilities of the employee/shipper ownership of that railroad. It is our understanding your office will communicate our message and that of other Milwaukee Road shippers to the Federal court so that body can consider this development as it prepares to rule on an embargo.

JAMES R. UNDERKOFER,  
President, Wisconsin Power and Light Co.

Sen. BELLEVUE, WASH.  
 Senator RUSSELL B. LONG,  
*Washington, D.C.:*

We believe that a plan for continued operation of the Milwaukee Road with employees and shippers should be pursued. Loss of the Milwaukee western facilities could result in significant effects on regional energy transport.

JOHN W. ELLIS,  
*President, Puget Sound Power and Light.*

Sen. HURON, S. DAK.  
 Senator RUSSELL B. LONG,  
*U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, D.C.:*

We urge that Congress explore ways in which to provide short term grants and long term low interest loans to help keep in operation the vital transportation service provided to this nation by the Milwaukee Railroad.

We are interested in having pursued all plans possible for continuing operation of the Milwaukee Railroad including ownership of the line by employees of the railroad.

Continued service by the Milwaukee Railroad is important to the citizens and economy of the entire nation as well as the State of South Dakota.

A. D. SCHMIDT,  
*President, Northwestern Public Service Co., Northwestern National Bank Bldg.*

Hon. BISMARCK, N.D.  
 RUSSELL B. LONG,  
*Washington, D.C.*

It is very important for Montana-Dakota utilities Co. and our customers in a 4-state area that the Milwaukee railroad continue operation. We are interested in an employee-shipper ownership plan if that will keep the railroad going.

DAVID M. HESKETT,  
*Chairman of the Board  
 and Chief Executive Officer.*

Sen. RAPID CITY, S.D.  
 RUSSELL B. LONG,  
*Washington, D.C.:*

We strongly support the concept of pursuing a plan whereby employee and shipper ownership could be developed to continue the Chicago Milwaukee rail service particularly as it affects deliveries within the state of South Dakota. It is our understanding that this plan is under consideration and it bears your most serious consideration.

Sincerely,

LARRY M. OWEN,  
*Vice President, Administration,  
 Black Hills Power and Light Co.*

Sen. RAYTOWN, MO.  
 LONG,  
*Washington, D.C.*

90 days for the Milwaukee road employee ownership.

Sen. KREMLIN, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in employee owned and shipper owned rail line in Montana.

BOB KOUTNIK,  
*Manager Farmers Union GTA Elevator.*

Sen. GREAT FALLS, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*Senate Office Bldg.,  
 Washington, D.C.:*

If the present Milwaukee Railroad management cannot or will not continue to operate their lines west to the coast I would strongly urge that the Senate support the alternate plan for a purchase and operation of the lines by the employee shipper group. If the Milwaukee western operation is abandoned

Montana will be without rail competition and many important grain shipping points will be without rail service.

WALTER V. HICKS,  
*Manager, Great Falls Shipping Assn.*

Sen. TOWNSEND, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, D.C.:*

We the Broadwater County Farm Bureau in Townsend, Montana urge you to support the effort by the employers and the shippers to purchase the Milwaukee Railroad.

PEGGY FLYNN,  
*Secretary.*

Sen. GREAT FALLS, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, D.C.*

We are interested in an employee-shipper owned railroad from Minneapolis to Portland, Oregon to take over the Milwaukee tracks.

DUANE A. OLSON,  
*Montana Traffic Manager.*

Sen. INVERNESS, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*Senate Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.*

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee owned and shipper owned rail line in Montana.

JIM SCHAEFER,  
*Farmers Union GTA.*

Sen. HUNTLEY, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*Senate Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.*

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee owned and shipper owned rail line in Montana.

FARMERS UNION GTA ELEVATOR.

Sen. GUILFORD, MONT.  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*Washington, D.C.*

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee owned and shipper owned rail line in Montana.

KENNY D. THUNE,  
*Manager, GTA Elevator.*

FAIRFIELD, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. U.S. SENATE,  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*Washington, D.C.:*

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

A. H. BERG,  
*Manager, GTA Elevator.*

CHESTER, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

GTA ELEVATOR.

Sen. RUDYARD, MONT.,  
 RUSSELL LONG,  
*Capitol 1, D.C.:*

We need Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION.

WINIFRED, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and we are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

PAUL SIELSTAD,  
*Manager, GTA Elevator.*

LEWISTON, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG,  
*Senate Office,  
 Washington, D.C.:*

We need the Milwaukee railroad in Montana and are very much interested in an employee-owned and a shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

HENRY MCDUNN,  
*Manager, GTA Terminal.*

BILLINGS, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG:

We need Milwaukee railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

FARMERS UNION GTA LINE ELEVATOR.

SQUARE BUTTE, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. WASHINGTON, D.C.:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

FARMERS UNION GTA.

THREE FORKS, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG,  
*Capitol One, D.C.:*

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

FARMERS UNION GTA ELEVATOR.

SHELBY, MONT.,  
 May 18, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG,  
*Capitol One, D.C.:*

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION.

POWDERVILLE, MONT.,  
 May 19, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG,  
*U.S. Senate,  
 Washington, D.C.*

We support shippers and employees as owners of the Milwaukee Railroad.

PETE and MARY HILL,  
*Shippers.*

FAIRFIELD, MONT.,  
 May 24, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG,  
*Chairman of the Subcommittee of Surface,  
 Washington, D.C.*

Northwest area wife ask your support J.S.R. 81. Detrimental to Montana agriculture economy to lose Milwaukee.

JO BRUNNER,  
*Northwest Area Spokeswoman.*

HINGHAM, MONT.,  
 May 21, 1979.

Sen. RUSSELL LONG:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned rail line in Montana.

GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION.



FORSYTH, MONT.,  
May 21, 1979.

Senator RUSSELL LONG:

We support the efforts of employees and shippers to purchase the Milwaukee Railroad.  
GEORGE T. ASAY.

BIG SANDY, MONT.,  
May 18, 1979.

Senator RUSSELL LONG:  
Washington, D.C.

We need a Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee-owned and shipper-owned line in Montana.  
TOM WORSLEY.

MOORE, MONT.,  
May 18, 1979.

Senator RUSSELL LONG:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana very interested in an employee owned and shipper owned rail line in Montana.  
Respectfully,

RAY KING MOORE.

CUT BANK, MONT.,  
May 18, 1979.

Senator RUSSELL LONG:

We need the Milwaukee Railroad in Montana and are very interested in an employee owned and shipper owned rail line in Montana.

NORMAN O. JOHNSON.

#### EXPORT TASK FORCE ARTICLE NO. 9: TRADE DEFICIT IN APRIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post held some grim news for the economy of the United States. After recording the lowest trade deficit in 2 years for the month of March, the April trade balance ballooned to a \$2.15 billion deficit.

This high deficit apparently stems from two factors. The first is higher oil prices coupled with increased purchases of foreign made automobiles, and secondly, the Teamsters Union strike in April delayed many U.S. exports.

The April trade deficit again points out the fact that America desperately needs a comprehensive export policy. To delay in the development of such a policy, increases the likelihood of many more monthly trade deficits in the future.

The article written by Art Pine appeared in the May 31 edition of the Washington Post follows:

AUTO, OIL IMPORTS HELP TRADE DEFICIT HIT  
\$2.15 BILLION  
(By Art Pine)

The nation's foreign trade deficit surged again in April as continuing increases in prices for imported crude oil—and a rush by Americans to buy more fuel-efficient imported cars—wiped out gains of the two previous months.

Commerce Department statistics showed the deficit swelled to \$2.15 billion in April from \$21.3 million in March and \$1.3 billion in February. The March deficit had been the smallest in almost two years.

Analysts said the worsening deficit stemmed from two factors:

The sharply higher oil prices and increased U.S. purchases of foreign-made automobiles pushed imports up a sharp 5 percent. American purchases of petroleum and related products soared 9 percent to a seasonally adjusted \$4.05 billion.

At the same time, exports declined by 3.9 percent, in part because many shippers were unable to get their goods to the docks during the Teamsters' union strike in April. Economists said exports would bounce back in May.

Analysts said it was too early to tell how much of the trade setback would prove to be long term. Although exports may rebound in May, imports are likely to remain high because of the sharp rise in oil prices.

Continued improvement in the trade deficit late in 1978 and earlier this year had led some analysts to hope for a major reduction in the red-ink figure during 1979. However, oil price increases have altered this outlook.

William A. Cox, the Commerce Department's deputy chief economist, said yesterday it still was "hard to say" how the trade deficit might turn out by the end of this year.

However, Cox noted that even if the deficit were to continue at April's level, overall it still would come in well below last year's record \$28.5 billion total.

The increase in U.S. purchases of imported cars accounted for just under half the rise in import levels last month. The bulk of the purchases were from Japan, with some rise in shipments from West Germany as well.

Another 44 percent of the rise in imports was attributed to increased oil purchases. Both the volume and the price of U.S. purchases of foreign oil rose substantially in April.

The April figures brought the cost of overall imports to \$16 billion, up \$763 million from March's level, while the cost of exports totaled \$13.9 billion, down some \$569 million from the previous month.

The figures showed the U.S. imported 266.8 million barrels of oil in April compared with 254.3 million in March, at a cost of \$4.04 billion, up from \$3.7 billion during March.

By comparison, U.S. oil imports a year ago totaled 246.3 million barrels at a cost of \$3.3 billion. Crude oil prices have been rising sharply since last January, in part because of the recent turmoil in Iran.

The \$2.15 billion deficit for April was recorded on the department's traditional basis. On another measure, used more widely by other countries, the deficit was \$3.17 billion, up from \$1.8 billion in March. ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SYNAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 24, 1979, I was in my district in Oklahoma, and necessarily absent during votes taken that day by the full House of Representatives.

Four rollover votes were held on May 24. Had I been present and voting on that date, I would have cast my votes in the following manner:

Rollover vote No. 170: House Concurrent Resolution 107, "yea."

Rollover vote No. 171: House Resolution 281, "yea."

Rollover vote No. 172: S. 869 (Eckhardt amendment), "nay."

Rollover vote No. 173: S. 869 (final passage), "yea." ●

#### LOOK AT YOUR GAS PUMP FIGURES—DO NOT GET SCARED; GET MAD

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to visit their neighborhood gas pumps and take a long, nostalgic look at the figures on the face.

A few months ahead we may be recalling these 80 and 90 cents a gallon prices as being the "good old days"—the stuff of which memories are made.

We have it on good authority that the prices are going up—and then on up some more.

Now, if you like high gasoline prices, that is fine. But I do not, and I have not run across any of my neighbors in the Seventh Kentucky District who do, either.

They feel like they are being held up at the gas pump by foreign suppliers who keep jacking up the prices.

We sell an awful lot of foodstuffs to the countries who gouge us on oil—but I cannot remember ever hearing anyone accuse us of profiteering on them.

I submit that the time has come for us to start playing it smart, and telling some of these oil producing countries that we can play their game, too.

They have us in a vulnerable position, and they know it. To me, the amazing thing is that we seem to lack the will to do anything about it.

No one wants to stand up and say, "Stop this foolishness. We've had enough. It is time we got out of this dependent position."

The South Africans are doing it—working day and night to complete a massive industrial complex to convert even more of their coal into energy fuels. They have been at it for several years.

The West Germans are doing it—and I understand they are well advanced in plans to construct a number of plants to rid themselves of dependence upon outside sources of oil. Many of us remember only too well how the German nation used its coal to produce liquid fuels to maintain its World War II fighting machine 35 years ago.

And Mr. Speaker, we can do it. We have the technology to do it. Numerous witnesses have appeared recently before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities to describe our capability of turning our abundant coal into liquid fuels and gases. We do not have to be dependent, and it should make every American angry when he sees us doing nothing about the problem.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to look at those figures on their gasoline pumps today. And I have this advice for them: Do not get scared. Get mad. ●

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STUMP for May 30, 31, and June 1, 1979, on account of official business in the District.

Mr. ERDAHL, at the request of Mr. RHODES, after 12 p.m. today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAUKE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MADIGAN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. CONABLE, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. CORCORAN, for 15 minutes, today.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL of Ohio), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
Mr. WEAVER, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. COTTER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CORRADA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. LUNDINE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. HALL of Ohio, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. MIKVA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. VAN DEERLIN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 30 minutes, today.  
Mr. DASCHLE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ALEXANDER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. BARNES, for 10 minutes, today.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SYMMS, immediately preceding the vote on the Bedell amendment, on H.R. 2575, in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. SEIBERLING, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2575, the defense authorization supplemental bill.

Mr. GILMAN, immediately following the special order of Mr. DE LA GARZA, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TAUKE) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.  
Mr. DORNAN in two instances.  
Mr. PAUL in five instances.  
Mr. ERDAHL.  
Mr. EMERY.  
Mr. ROTH.  
Mr. COLLINS of Texas in two instances.  
Mr. BURGNER.  
Mr. MOORE.  
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.  
Mr. LEE.  
Mr. LEACH of Iowa.  
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.  
Mr. BADHAM.  
Mr. MICHEL.  
Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.  
Mr. EVANS of Delaware.  
Mr. STANGELAND.  
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.  
Mr. GRISHAM.  
Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. HAGEDORN.

Mr. CARNEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDGAR in two instances.  
Mr. KILDEE.  
Mr. DRINAN.  
Mr. OBERSTAR.  
Mr. SIMON.  
Mr. CLAY.  
Mr. CORRADA.  
Mr. BLANCHARD in two instances.  
Mr. O'NEILL.  
Mr. STOKES.  
Mr. ADDABBO.  
Mr. GEPHARDT.  
Mr. SANTINI.  
Mr. UDALL.  
Mr. GUARINI.  
Mr. BRADEMANS in five instances.  
Mr. SWIFT.  
Mr. DASCHLE in two instances.  
Mr. SKELTON.  
Mr. HARRIS.  
Ms. FERRARO.  
Mr. OTTINGER in five instances.  
Mr. BEDELL.  
Mrs. SCHROEDER in two instances.  
Mr. McDONALD in five instances.  
Mr. WEISS.  
Mr. HEFNER.  
Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
Mr. ROBINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKAY.  
Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.  
Mr. FITHIAN.  
Mr. BEVILL.  
Mr. APPLGATE.  
Mr. CONYERS.  
Mr. KOSTMAYER.  
Mr. FLIPPO.  
Mr. FLORIO.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3404. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act to authorize Federal Reserve banks to lend certain obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury to meet the short-term cash requirements of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to: accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 4, 1979, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1724. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, trans-

mitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 79-37), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1725. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 79-38), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1726. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Army's intention to offer to sell certain defense services to Saudi Arabia (transmittal No. 79-39), pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1727. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the first semi-annual report of the Inspector General of the Veterans' Administration, pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 95-452; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1728. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting his quarterly report of receipts and expenditures for the period January 1 through March 31, 1979, pursuant to section 105(a) of Public Law 88-454, as amended (H. Doc. No. 96-136); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1729. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the appropriations authorization for reporting of weather modification activities; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

1730. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add clarifying amendments to the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 198. Resolution dismissing the election contest against Parren J. Mitchell (Rept. No. 96-226). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4289. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 96-227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 4259. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to present a gold medal to the American Red Cross; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BEDELL:

H.R. 4280. A bill to prohibit the use of water from certain Federal reclamation projects for the irrigation of surplus crops within 10 years of the completion date of such projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.



By Mr. JOHN L. BURTON:

H.R. 4261. A bill designating the daisy and all its varieties as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COTTER (for himself, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. SHANNON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BRODHEAD):

H.R. 4262. A bill to impose a windfall profit tax on domestic crude oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act to prevent the termination of franchises for the retail distribution of diesel fuel in certain cases in which a substantial portion of the diesel fuel is sold for agricultural or other essential uses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Copyright Law to provide that certain performances and displays of profitmaking educational institutions are not infringements of the exclusive rights of copyright owners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide individuals a credit against income tax for amounts paid or incurred by the taxpayer for alterations to his principal residence in order to make such residence more suitable for handicapped family members; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 4266. A bill to protect certain small businesses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 4267. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act for the purpose of authorizing the President to enter into agreements establishing reciprocal arrangements between the medicare program and similar programs of any foreign country; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a refundable tax credit for amounts paid for increases in electricity under automatic fuel adjustment clauses as a result of the shutdown of the nuclear plant at Three Mile Island near Middletown, Pa.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio:

H.R. 4269. A bill to promote the observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States, to provide for congressional approval of any bilateral assistance to countries which violate human rights, to require U.S. human rights policies in international financial institutions to be consistent with such policies with respect to U.S. bilateral assistance, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HUBBARD:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to facilitate compliance by simplifying the requirements imposed under that act, to facilitate administrative enforcement of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFORDS:

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act to allow the States to reduce the amount expended for State institutional library services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4272. A bill to limit the service of civil process by U.S. marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4273. A bill to amend section 17 of the act of July 5, 1946, as amended, entitled "An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOGOVSEK:

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reduce the minimum unit size requirement for units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

H.R. 4275. A bill to designate the aquarium to be built on the site on Pratt Street, pier 3, Baltimore Inner Harbor, Baltimore, Md., as the "National Aquarium"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 4276. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with a view to determining the feasibility of establishing the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 4277. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States by repealing item 807.00 relating to certain articles assembled abroad from fabricated components which are products of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to revise and improve the laws controlling false identification crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself, Mr. SCHULZE, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 4279. A bill to establish a commission to study the feasibility of constructing a monument dedicated to the duties and responsibilities of citizens of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 4280. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow any individual who sold his principal residence after December 31, 1977, and before July 27, 1978, and who attained age 65 before the date of such sale a special election to exclude up to \$100,000 of gain on the sale of such residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SPELLMAN:

H.R. 4281. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Federal employee service and indemnity health benefits plans require second opinions in the case of elective surgery covered under those plans; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 4282. A bill to repeal section 19 of Public Law 95-142; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOFFETT (for himself, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WIRTHE, Mr. GORE, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to establish an emergency program for the conservation of gasoline and diesel oil; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4289. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Long-Term Care be called by the President of the United States in 1979, to be planned and conducted by the

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty should reinstate Uighur language broadcasts to the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STANGELAND:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should immediately establish and appoint a National Energy Council; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Res. 293. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a standing committee on energy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H. Res. 294. Resolution to designate June 9, 1979, as "Gravesend, Brooklyn-New York and Gravesend, England Twin Communities' Anniversary Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

208. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the fuel shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

209. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Vietnam Veterans Week; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of tenants of Scully Lands in Marion County, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Morris and Lenke Gelb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Ralph W. Clayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
H.R. 4287. A bill for the relief of Cheryl Cracknell Greenen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANGELAND:

H.R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Pio Oco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Res. 295. Resolution to refer the bill H.R. 4162 for the relief of the estate of Maj. John E. Doyle to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1825: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.  
H.R. 2382: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURGNER, Mrs. BOUQUARD, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of the Virgin Islands, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ZEFERETTI.

H.R. 2445: Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PATTERSON, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 2551: Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ROE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. EMERY, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. CARR, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. LEE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2647: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. HOLLENBECK, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 2648: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. HOLLENBECK.

H.R. 2777: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. McDONALD, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, and Mr. CLEVELAND.

H.R. 3283: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 3293: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 3294: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 3295: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. TAUKE.

H.R. 3403: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 3613: Mr. COELHO, Mr. GUDGER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. CORCORAN.

H.R. 3687: Mr. BREAUX.

H.R. 3719: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. CLEVELAND.

H.R. 3769: Mr. HOLLENBECK.

H.R. 3912: Mr. NEAL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. ETEL, Mr. EVANS

of the Virgin Islands, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. FISH, and Mr. GUDGER.

H.R. 4027: Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CAVANAUGH, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.R. 4067: Mr. BREAUX.

H.R. 4224: Mrs. SNOWE.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. ADDABO, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. COTTER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 272: Mr. WINN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MICA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. BLANCHARD, and Mr. DOUGHERTY.

H. Res. 186: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOUGHERTY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, and Mr. TAUKE.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERATIONS ADDRESSED BY STRONG ALASKA BILL

#### HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act has the potential of being the greatest conservation law in our Nation's history. In my remarks on May 15 last year, I expressed my view that the Udall-Seiberling bill, H.R. 39, was an act of foresight, creating national parks and wildlife refuges in Alaska that will provide their greatest benefits to future generations, just as Yosemite and Yellowstone are benefiting our generation more than they did the people of the 19th century. Unfortunately, a strong Alaska bill failed to pass the Senate last year, and this year we again were faced with the responsibility of passing a bill to preserve the natural treasures of Alaska.

Far more than last year, legislation emerging from the Interior and Merchant Marine Committees was damaged by an overzealous response to the mining, timber, and oil industries. I think it is time to respond more clearly to the concern of the public, hence my support for the Udall-Anderson substitute to H.R. 39.

"Can't we save something that is still the way it has been for tens of thousands of years without first desecrating it with roads, mines, pipelines and other man-made scars?" a March 15, 1979, article in the Pittsburgh Press asked. I am gratified that the House's answer to that question has been yes. We cannot afford to let these wilderness and wildlife lands be whittled away. The loss would not be just ours, but our children's.

Built upon last year's H.R. 39 (and the legislation introduced this year and

cosponsored by one-third of all House Members including myself), the Udall-Anderson substitute is a carefully refined and balanced bill. As a member of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, I have been particularly interested in the transportation aspects of the Alaska legislation. One of the obstacles to efficient surface transportation in the lower 48 States has been the great difficulty of planning routes that do not conflict with existing land uses. Anywhere you want to build a highway, a rail line, a pipeline, or a power transmission line, you run into conflict with people's houses, farms, industrial areas, or parks. It always boils down to a question of who gets the short end of the stick.

On the public lands in Alaska, the situation is so different that it seems like another world. Most of the land is still in public ownership, and has not been committed to specific uses. There are several major transportation routes, such as the Alaska Highway, the Alaska Railroad, and the corridor that embraces the Alaska oil pipeline and its associated highway. But most of Alaska's surface transportation network remains to be built.

Transportation was a major factor in the development of H.R. 39 and the Udall-Anderson substitute. Long before legislation was introduced, the transportation needs of Alaska were being studied by State and Federal agencies. The Alaska Department of Highways in 1973 proposed a system of transportation corridors crisscrossing the State. In 1974, the Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management prepared a primary corridor system plan, chiefly intended for transportation of energy resources. The joint State-Federal Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska made its own study of the transportation outlook and held hearings across the State, but declined to identify specific corridors. Again during the field hearings of the House Interior Committee's Subcommittee on General Oversight and Alaska

Lands, many people gave their ideas on Alaska's future transportation needs.

As an outgrowth of years of study by the agencies, and hearings by the subcommittee, the boundaries of the conservation areas in H.R. 39, and subsequently the Udall-Anderson substitute, were adjusted to avoid conflict with essential transportation needs by leaving the needed corridors outside the conservation areas.

The unforeseeable needs are addressed by title X of the Udall-Anderson substitute, entitled "Transportation and Utility Systems on Conservation System Units." First, this title states that all existing laws allowing transportation rights-of-way across areas of the National Park System, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Wildlife Refuge System, and National Wilderness Preservation System shall apply to the areas established by the Udall-Anderson substitute.

Then it goes on to set up a procedure for roads, pipelines, and utility lines that are not allowed by those existing authorities. This title X procedure would seldom be needed, because the Secretary of the Interior already has ample authority for most transportation rights-of-way in the conservation systems. The new procedure would be used chiefly for transportation routes across the designated wilderness areas.

Access to mining claims and State or private property is expressly guaranteed, no matter where this property is located.

There is some concern that title X may be too generous to those who would build transportation routes across the national interest lands. The Interior Department has cautioned that this title may actually promote the use of these conservation lands for transportation purposes by providing expedited Federal action that is not available for right-of-way applications on other Federal lands.

My conclusion is that transportation needs have been thoroughly and satisfactorily taken into account in the Udall-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.



Anderson substitute. In this bill we are protecting a large and still unimpaired share of wild America for public use. At the same time we are providing for the future transportation needs of Alaska. ●

#### CURBING OPEC'S POWER

### HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, it is increasingly obvious that our policy or lack of policy regarding OPEC is as important, if not more important, than any action we take regarding domestic oil production and policy. I fear our present policy regarding OPEC needs immediate study and reconsideration in light of recent events.

An article by Hobart Rowen in today's Washington Post well states the problem and suggests some approaches we might consider. No issue deserves more immediate consideration by Congress and the administration. A full reprint of Mr. Rowen's article is as follows:

#### CURBING OPEC'S POWER

(By Hobart Rowen)

OPEC has now raised oil prices 28 percent since the beginning of this year—and the cartel isn't finished with its plans for sticking it to the consuming nations, rich and poor. We'll soon look back on \$1-a-gallon gas as cheap.

The grim fact that OPEC has become the main engine of worldwide inflation has now been recognized in a series of statements by senior administration officials.

The new burst of rhetoric began with testimony on Capitol Hill by Treasury Secretary W. Michael Blumenthal and Under Secretary of State Richard Cooper, who said that worldwide inflation had reached "a dangerous point" as a result of the oil price increases.

For the past four months, inflation here has been rising at an annual rate of 14 percent. Hopes that inflation might recede later this year have been dashed by the steady upward ratcheting of oil prices.

The U.S. oil import bill, last year \$42 billion, is expected to run \$52 billion to \$55 billion in 1979. Unchecked, we are heading to the incredible oil import level of \$100 billion in the mid-1980s. What happens to the dollar in such a situation?

It was left to presidential aide Stuart E. Eizenstat to bring the new worry into sharpest focus. The mild economic slowdown desired by the Carter administration to curb inflation "would turn into a recession," Eizenstat told a TV audience, if OPEC raises prices further.

"They are going to badly damage the world economy," Eizenstat said. And he pointed out that among those injured would be the poor nations "with whom they [OPEC] profess to have a great deal of sympathy."

The administration comes a little late to a public acknowledgment of the oil cartel's power. For so long, officials argued, the best policy was to turn the other cheek, and depend on OPEC's need to buy goods and services from the West, while reinvesting the cartel's surplus funds. "Recycling" was the magic watchword.

But it is now estimated that after all investments, purchases and extravagances of Arab royalty, OPEC surpluses will be \$30 billion or more in this calendar year. That's about the same level as the aggregate bal-

ance of payment deficits of the debt-burdened poor nations.

A sense of desperation runs through the Blumenthal-Cooper-Eizenstat statements. They propose no moves the United States should take to retaliate against OPEC, alone or in concert with others.

Yet, they see clearly the handwriting on the wall in terms of future OPEC pricing policy. The cartel managers learned a great lesson from the Iranian revolution: Less means more.

"Everybody always said that the cartel could make more money by keeping it in the ground. But they never really did it until the Iranian mess showed that it was practical. The Iranians discovered they could make as much money from 4 million barrels a day as from 6 million. Now, the rest of them, including our friends the Saudis, are following suit," one official says.

Meanwhile, the cartel's success in creating a shortage of supply has panicked buyers into bidding for "oil at any price." It is authoritatively reported that Ecuador sold 600,000 barrels last week for an incredible \$36 a barrel, more than double the current official price. With spot prices going through the roof, OPEC will boost the official price again in Geneva on June 26.

What can be done? Obviously, the first answer is to boost other sources of supply. That includes not only coal and all alternatives to oil, but something better than the ham-handed approaches that have been made to Mexico to acquire a share of its oil and gas.

Second, conservation has to be directed by government order, not left to voluntary compliance. That means, among other things, getting Congress off its duff to vote for rationing authority.

Third, any number of ideas for curbing OPEC's power, rated as impractical, strange or nutty by the establishment need to be examined carefully. For example, a number of congressmen have introduced H.R. 3604, which would establish a federal nonprofit corporation as the sole importing agent for oil. Economists John Kenneth Galbraith says: "The creation of this bargaining instrument is the completely logical, completely plausible answer . . . to the bargaining power of the other side." Surely, it's at least one answer to be considered.

For too long, officials like Emile Van Lennep, head of the industrial nations grouped in the OECD, have been saying, as he did on May 21, that "nothing . . . can be done" about the OPEC price increases themselves. Lennep accepts everything OPEC has done, and limits himself to recommending offsetting policies persuading wage-earners to "accept the cut in real incomes resulting from the rise in oil prices."

It is time to put an end to this defeatist attitude. Two days after the OPEC summit meeting in Geneva, there will be an economic summit in Tokyo among the seven major world powers. If this is to be more than a charade, the issue of how to deal directly with OPEC—an issue politely buried at earlier summits—needs to be explored on a forthright basis. There is no more pressing problem for the head of state. ●

#### OBSTACLES TO BLACK ECONOMIC PROGRESS

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter E. Williams, associate professor of economics at Temple University, is one of

our country's most eloquent spokesmen for economic opportunity for blacks.

Dr. Williams, who is black himself, analyzes all the well-intentioned social programs and the perhaps not-so-well-intentioned labor laws, and concludes that they are obstacles to black economic progress.

Black Americans need the free market, and I would like to bring Dr. Williams' excellent article from today's Wall Street Journal on this subject to my colleagues' attention.

The article follows:

#### POLITICAL "SAVIORS" DON'T DELIVER WHAT BLACKS NEED

(By Walter E. Williams)

With the approach of the 1980 presidential elections, the murmurings are that the real savior of black people is Sen. Edward Kennedy. These murmurings emanate from the same people who successfully convinced black people that President Carter was the real savior. Mr. Carter's proposed budget cuts and reductions in social programs are viewed as a betrayal of his campaign pledge to help the poor.

This leaves Mr. Carter in the position of being able to confront blacks with the proposition: If you don't help me get reelected you won't even get peanuts.

But this leaves an important question unanswered: Why do blacks need a political savior? Why do they need government largess and paternalism while disadvantaged groups of the past did not? The most unique feature of the U.S. is that we are a nation of minorities. No minority was welcomed to our shores with open arms. All were persecuted in varying degrees. These minorities (Jews, Orientals, Irish, Italians and so on) made it into the mainstream of American society without "social commitment" and often in the face of open hostility. Are blacks mentally incompetent and hence in need of paternal support?

Of course not. Witness the progress of blacks up from slavery in the space of only 100 years. Then what is the problem? Much of the success of earlier disadvantaged minorities—and much of the difference between blacks and earlier minorities—is that when they came to our cities they faced a relatively open economic system.

There were sweatshops, peddlers and all kinds of domestic jobs. There was no minimum wage law; workers could be paid by the piece rate; there were few licensed occupations and businesses. What all of this means was that one could be unskilled and still get a job and ultimately learn skills. Today's laws that require either federal or union-dictated minimum wages and the numerous occupational licensure laws effectively bar employment to the lowest skilled people.

Justifications for these laws are many: inhumane work, unsafe jobs, exploitative wages and so forth. Whatever the justification for these laws, their effect is to cut off the lower rungs of the economic ladder. The very people who went through these "inhumane" conditions are solidly in the mainstream of American society and the people who are "protected" from these conditions are having the difficulties.

What disadvantaged black people need is not a savior and not leaders; they need the opportunity to be able to compete in the market. Neither the President nor black political representatives show a desire to change laws that restrict competition in ways very costly to blacks. In fact, congressional blacks in discharging their responsibilities to labor unions vote for and support legislation that makes many of the people who voted for them worse off.

The minimum wage law is one such law

that receives the unanimous support of black Congressmen. This support comes in spite of the abundance of economic evidence that shows the minimum wage law discriminates against the most disadvantaged worker. The evidence of this is seen in the unprecedented high rates of unemployment among younger blacks. The unemployment rate for young blacks exceeds, by multiples, that experienced during the most hostile times of overt discrimination but when there was no minimum wage law.

The Davis-Bacon Act is a law which requires the payment of "prevailing" wages on federally funded or assisted construction projects. Often this means the government pays the going union rate and hires union labor, rather than employing non-union construction workers. But most black construction workers are in the non-union sector. Therefore the Davis-Bacon Act discriminates against black workers and contractors in an indirect fashion. It also directly raises the cost of federally funded or assisted low income housing.

In fact part of the original intent of the Davis-Bacon Act was to get blacks out of federal construction jobs. This is evidenced in much of the floor debate cited in the Congressional Record in 1931. As Congressman Allgood said flatly at one point: "That contractor has cheap colored labor that he transports, and he puts them in cabins, and it is labor of that sort that is in competition with white labor throughout the country."

There are numerous other laws which effectively remove the bottom steps on the economic ladder. None of these laws are more vividly seen than the taxi law in New York City. In 1925 a poor, illiterate, however industrious immigrant could buy a used car and write the word "TAXI" on it and he was thus in business providing a livelihood for his family. Today's poor New Yorker seeking a similar path to upward mobility needs more than industry and a used car. He needs a hack license costing about \$60,000.

Basically, then, blacks don't need massive social spending. They need legislative changes that improve economic opportunity, especially in the labor market. Nor do they need politicians who tell them that the enemy is General Motors, U.S. Steel or IBM. For black upward mobility, open entry further down the economic ladder is a bigger problem and a bigger opportunity.

But black political leaders and white "liberals," for reasons of electoral convenience, have formed alliances with the very people in whose interest it is to restrict job entry. Carpenters, plumbers, electricians and the like are far more threatened by those at the bottom of the economic heap than GM or IBM, and it is the liberals who have been quickest to exploit these fears.

No doubt appeals to resurrect the American ideal of open markets will fall on deaf ears. There are a number of people black and white who have a stake in costly social programs and the continued existence of poor and dependent people. These are the same people who cry loudest about limitations on government spending. They are the people who advocate feeding the horses in order to feed the sparrows. Of course, if one is a horse it is the desired means of feeding the sparrows. ●

IN MEMORIAM: MARY MURTAGH

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Office of Tech-

nology Assessment, I was served ably and well by a young woman who was the congressional liaison—Ms. Mary Murtagh. Mary died Monday, and the loss felt by myself and everyone fortunate enough to have known her is only beginning to take hold. In her official capacity she was known for an unwavering sense of duty to the Board, and an uncanny sense of diplomacy. Many can vouch for the skill with which she enabled me to avoid the pitfalls of chairing the TAB. The continuity brought to her office from the previous Congress, under the chairmanship of Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, allowed me to profit from her accumulated experience. We feel a sense of drift from her absence that she herself, always the pro, would disapprove.

But it is not in her official capacity that she will be most remembered. Simply put, it was Mary's deep, unambiguous humanity that endeared us. Her morality had a fine edge; her sense of right and wrong allowed no cavil. I am sorry that I can no longer work with her; but I am more sorry that we all may not longer profit from her terrific character. She was a beauty. ●

#### VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK

HON. DAVID F. EMERY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1979

● Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, throughout this week, the entire Nation is paying special tribute to those brave men who answered their Nation's call to arms to serve in the Republic of Vietnam. These brave young men made a great sacrifice to their Nation and deserve our sincerest gratitude.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues two editorials which I feel express the sentiments of many Americans with respect to those who gave their blood, sweat, tears and lives in a distant place known as South Vietnam. The first article appeared in the Army magazine; the second appeared in Morning Sentinel which is published in Waterville, Maine.

The articles follow:

[From Army Magazine]

AT LAST AN OVERDUE "WELCOME HOME"

The daring folks in Max Cleland's office have come up with a really kinky idea. They want all of us to give some recognition to Vietnam era veterans during Memorial Day week this year—and get this: the vast majority of the objects of our hoped-for attention never deserted a day in their lives, never refused an order to fight, never fled to Canada or Sweden to avoid service, and never got cited in a newspaper crime story as a "Vietnam veteran."

No, what President Carter, Mr. Cleland, his administrator of veterans affairs, and Congress want the nation to do is to pay tribute to the nearly 9,000,000 veterans of that period who did what was asked of them and then returned home—in a plane seat, on a stretcher or in a casket.

It's about time.

In a period about which America has much to regret, there was a no more shameful episode than the treatment afforded those who

wore the uniform. Veterans of previous wars came home to bands and the smiles of a grateful nation; those from Vietnam got scowls, verbal abuse in public places and an unemployment record that was a national disgrace. And then we topped all this off by officially dignifying the sneers of their detractors by extending amnesty to those who sat up in Canada and derided them as fools.

Mr. Cleland, himself a veteran of the Vietnam conflict, told a group of editors recently that those who served still suffer from deep psychological scars:

"They served with bravery fully equal to that of Americans who served in other wars. Yet, they are a different group of veterans—one beset by lingering problems and by an uncertainty that their service was just."

Mr. Cleland called this group the "silent veterans—you just don't hear much about them unless it's negative." They are among the business, professional and everyday people whose contributions to the community make up the news columns, but chances are one is never identified as a Vietnam veteran until he robs a store or shoots someone. The result, says Mr. Cleland, is perpetuation of the "myths that Vietnam veterans are 'walking time bombs' we cannot trust."

Who is the Vietnam era veteran? He or she is among 8,811,000 Americans who served in the armed forces between 5 August, 1964, and 7 May, 1975. Thirty percent of those who are now civilians saw service in Vietnam. Ninety percent are white, 9.3 percent black and .7 percent of other racial origins. There are 178,000 women, 81 percent are high school graduates, and 96 percent were discharged under honorable conditions.

They left behind 46,616 comrades who were killed in action and some 10,000 others whose deaths were war-related. Another 612 are still listed as missing in action.

As a group, their median family income is a third higher than their nonveteran peers, but the unemployment rate for those between 25 and 29 years of age is 8.6 percent, compared to 5.1 percent for nonveterans in the same age group. For blacks, the difference is 13.17 to 8.7 percent. In the years right after the war the disparities were much worse.

Still-vocal antimilitarists point to the high incidence of psychological problems among Vietnam veterans as further evidence of the inherent "evilness" of the war they fought. Nonsense—the typical Vietnam veteran is no different from those who served in any other war: he has a job, loves his kids and is no more inclined to violent behavior than those who never wore a uniform—and certainly less than the self-proclaimed pacifists who regularly trashed our cities in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

If the Vietnam veteran's readjustment problems have been more widespread than his predecessors' (a Veterans Administration survey shows that nearly half of those disabled in the Vietnam era have had such problems), then our society must take a large part of the blame. Our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen served their nation as well as any fighting force in history. They didn't start the war and they had better reasons to despise it than those at home.

Whether they believed in their cause—and many did—is beside the point; they did what their country expected of them.

For that, they, not the draft dodgers, deserters and Hanoi sympathizers among us, are the era's pariahs.

One of the reasons the President gave for extending amnesty to selective service evaders was that such a gesture would "bind up the nation's [war] wounds." Mr. Carter's proclamation setting 28 May to 3 June as Vietnam Veterans Week was moving, eloquent and sincere, but it did not contain this phrase and the assumption must be made that amnesty supporters did indeed consider that those wounds were healed when the evaders were forgiven.



If so, they are wrong. That will not happen until the country rights the wrongs its people have done to those who wore the uniform in one of history's most bitter conflicts.

They couldn't be blamed if they told us all to go to hell.

But they won't, not if the nation truly turns out to stage a shamefully overdue "welcome home."

[From the Morning (Maine) Sentinel]

#### VIETS VETS DESERVE BETTER

Vietnam went away for awhile. The anti-war people had condemned it as immoral, and finally Richard Nixon got the message and stopped the war. Being America's first military defeat in history—and at that by a small third-rate Asian country—it was a war most Americans wanted to forget.

In fact, the men who went to Vietnam to fight and bleed and die were pretty much forgotten while they were there, except by their families. Lyndon Johnson's America was too busy enjoying guns and butter and the good life to spend too much time and thought on a nasty, undeclared war that was going on half a world away. And when that undeclared war was over, the men who fought it and survived came home to a non-hero's welcome. There were no bands, no cheering crowds—just relieved families grateful to have their sons, husbands, and fathers home.

But the performing arts picked up where the anti-war people left off, and we have had a spate of movies, TV films, and books about American aggression in Vietnam. The movie "Coming Home" carries the message that because Vietnam was an unjust war, any veteran should be ashamed to have fought in it. The recent TV movie "Friendly Fire" was an emotionally grinding account of two parents' search for the cause of their son's death in Vietnam—a particularly needless death from "non-hostile fire." The military was portrayed as peopled by heartless PR men, doing their best to put a good face on a shabby system designed to cover up incompetence and bungling by American officers in the field.

But the men who went to Vietnam deserve much more than a guilt complex from their countrymen. The vast majority of them went, not willingly, but because their country called. And when they got there, the vast majority performed the same acts of valor and bravery that American soldiers have in every other war.

Robert Di Niro's film "The Deer Hunter" pays overdue tribute to those qualities. It is a welcome relief from the post-Vietnam guilt complex foisted on American veterans by too many people who have never known the pain and hell of war. It reminds us that an awful lot of young men chose not to win draft deferment by going to college, chose not to run away to Canada.

Certainly, the protesters served a valuable role in halting a war we never should have entered. But if those who did go to fight that war are cast as pariahs who must continue to pay permanent penance, we spurn the very qualities of patriotism and sacrifice that built a country in which protest can exist. And we are faced with the uneasy question: How will young Americans respond to the call to arms in any future "just" war? ●

#### FIFTH DISTRICT TENNESSEANS ASK THE TRUTH ABOUT ENERGY

#### HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Fifth District of

Tennessee are doing a lot of thinking about energy these days. As I read my congressional mail and speak personally with the residents of Davidson, Cheatham, and Robertson Counties, I find there is great concern if our Nation does, in fact, have an energy shortage.

Angry and resentful people are blaming the one institution that not only grows richer every time there is an oil squeeze, but is as close at hand as the nearest service station: The \$360 billion a year U.S. oil industry. Sixty-nine percent of the public still believe that gasoline prices are rising, not because there is an energy crisis but merely because the oil companies want to make more money.

I have read a series of reports from the petroleum industry which show that combined profits from January through March 1979, ran 57 percent above these of the same companies in the first quarter of 1978. It appears that every time there is a report of an oil shortage, the oil companies tend to grow richer. As the demand for gasoline mounts, the retail price moves to the new, higher ceiling. In the last 6 months alone, the average retail price of gasoline has risen from 67 cents to 77 cents at the pump. Reports indicate that oil prices may rise above the \$1 mark this summer. Accordingly, over the past year, Gulf's profits increased 61 percent; Texaco's 81 percent; Marathon Oil rose 108 percent; and Standard Oil of Ohio increased 303 percent. The biggest oil multinational of them all, Exxon Corp., reported a gain of 37.4 percent, to \$995 million, by far the most impressive 3-month earnings period in the company's history.

The question arises, Mr. Speaker, whether the oil barons are manipulating the market and/or creating a self-imposed shortage. I believe the oil companies have created an extreme amount of mistrust in the American public. Many of these powerful oil companies have huge investments in all four aspects of the business: Drilling, transporting, refining, and marketing. They act as producer, middleman, and seller. This control over the stream of commerce in the oil industry should be examined to determine if changes are necessary in this monopolistic practice.

There are many questions that remain to be answered: Is there an oil shortage? What can be done to avoid a shortage of oil in the near future? Will energy prices keep going up? What will solar power do to help our energy problems? Why do we not use more coal? What role can alcohol fuels play? How can we prevent the oil companies from making excessive profits?

To protect the American consumer, Congress should enact an effective windfall profits tax in order that the oil companies cannot continue to "cash in" on the reports of an oil shortage. If there is in fact an oil shortage, we must not allow the oil companies to capitalize on this crisis. The windfall profits tax should reflect the attitude of the American people by discouraging these companies from increasing their profits. Congress should take a hard line in this area by passing a windfall profits tax that will protect the consumer. I do not

believe Congress will adequately express the views of the American public unless a stern and promising windfall profits tax is passed.

In documenting my concerns, Mr. Speaker, just today, the Department of Energy has detailed that seven major oil companies will illegally overcharge consumers \$1.7 billion for crude oil. The oil companies improperly reclassified low-priced oil so that it sold for more than twice the amount permitted by Government price controls. The DOE's list of overcharges include: Texaco \$888.3 million; Gulf Oil \$577.9 million; Standard Oil Co. of California \$101.6 million; Atlantic Richfield \$42 million; Marathon Oil \$29 million; Standard Oil of Indiana \$24.1 million; and Standard Oil of Ohio \$16 million.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee ask for an end to excessive oil company profits. In voicing the views of the citizens of the Fifth District of Tennessee, I urge Congress to enact legislation which would protect our Nation's consumers. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I believe we in the Congress must insist on two major objectives relating to the oil situation. First, and foremost, we must assure that there is sufficient gas available to Americans so as not to hurt our national economy and drastically change individual American lifestyles. Second, and a more difficult priority, is to assure each and every citizen that oil is available, and available at a rate as cheap as possible. Inexpensive oil for motorists, homeowners, businessmen, and other areas of our society and economy should be a top priority for this Congress and the American people. ●

#### ENERGY CONSERVATION

#### HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, America's energy problem is quickly becoming the most serious problem we face. Yet there is a lack of information about the problem and a lack of creative ideas about how we can begin to cope with it. I came across an interesting editorial in the May 30 Philadelphia Inquirer which I would like to share with my colleagues. The editorial follows:

A CHEAP SOURCE OF ENERGY: CONSERVATION  
(By Daniel Yergin)

By this time last year, energy had become one of America's most tired subjects. Not anymore. Iran and rising prices, the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island, and the lengthening gasoline lines in different parts of the country—all these have driven the abstraction of the energy problem very directly into people's immediate lives—and pocketbooks.

One result is that energy conservation has been lifted out of the ranks of retired platitudes. It is back on the national agenda, and in a big way.

Not that many people are particularly in favor of conservation. At best, it is regarded as an unpleasant and painful medicine—sacrifice, denial.

To be sure, that is one kind of conservation—the conservation of curtailment that

is imposed by gas lines and "no gas" signs. But that is definitely not the only kind of conservation.

There is an altogether different type of conservation—energy efficiency, energy productivity—that will enable us to avoid the sacrifice and pain of gas lines and shortages and ever-rising prices. To clarify the matter, this kind of conservation can be thought of as an alternative source of energy.

Such was the case made in 1974, when President Ford met with his advisers at Camp David to discuss what to do in the aftermath of the first energy shock. One of those present, Roger Sant, then an assistant Federal Energy Administrator, argued that energy conservation—saving energy—should be regarded as an energy source.

In other words, compare how many units of energy you get by investing in new production with how many you get from investing in energy saving. Conservation, Sant insisted, would prove to be a good buy.

President Gerald Ford did not buy Sant's argument. Instead, he announced that the United States would, between 1975 and 1985, build 200 new nuclear power plants, 150 major coal-fired plants, 30 major new oil refineries, and 20 major new synthetic fuel plants.

A half decade and another energy shock later, it has become clear that not much of Ford's program will come to pass.

Today, Sant, now director of an industrial energy use program for Carnegie-Mellon University, argues that it may be economical to invest as much as \$220 billion in energy-saving, rather than conventional energy production. It's that good a source, he says.

Still, there has been a growing evidence for the idea that substantial energy savings—a reduction of 30 to 40 percent—would be possible in the United States without undercutting the standard of living. The way specialists put the matter is that energy consumption and economic growth can be "decoupled." The productivity of energy can be increased so that each unit of energy does more than it has in the past.

There has been a definite evolution of views in this direction. "There is no empirical evidence to indicate that the coupling of energy to economic growth can be decoupled," warned an economist at one of the major oil companies a few years ago.

However, last year, the chief economist for Shell Oil Co. predicted that energy consumption in the United States could grow more slowly than economic growth in the years ahead. "We have found," he said, "that we could decouple the two."

The general evidence for decoupling comes from a recognition of the erratic relationship between energy use and economic activity in the United States. Also, West Germany, another advanced nation, uses only three quarters as much energy for each unit of gross national product as the United States, and France, only half.

An increasing body of case studies lends support to the general observation. Dow Chemical, which happens to be one of the three largest industrial users of energy, has reduced its energy consumption by 40 percent per pound of product over the last decade. And this was accomplished with relatively little capital investment.

Similar evidence is mounting for homes and apartments, where many studies across the country indicate that 30 to 40 percent reductions in energy use are possible with relatively little investment. The most intensive study to date is one carried out by Princeton University researchers at Twin Rivers, N.J.

These researchers found that 67 percent reduction in annual energy consumption for space heating in homes was possible with a relatively simple package—interior window insulation, basement and attic insulation, and plugging of air leaks.

"Among the ways of conserving household energy, there are no spectacular technical fixes," Robert Socolow, the chief researchers, concluded in a new book, "Saving Energy in the Home." "There is only a catalog of small fixes, many of them drab and unimpressive in isolation . . . But the catalog is fat, and many of its entries are cheap."

While the possibilities for relatively painless conservation seem large in the United States, the potential is far from realized. Even gasoline consumption is much higher than the introduction of the more efficient new automobiles would have led one to predict a couple of years ago. This growth is one of the main reasons for the wrong kind of conservation—conservation by curtailment—which we are seeing in today's gas lines.

"We have learned that the requirements for energy use are extraordinarily flexible," observed Lee Schipper of the Lawrence Berkeley Radiation Laboratory at the University of California. Schipper is one of the best-known conservation researchers in the United States.

"But the message about energy flexibility has not gotten through," he says. "People either look at the wrong indicators or they want results too quickly. And people still don't believe energy is scarce. They are led to believe, mistakenly, that such alternatives to OPEC oil as coal and nuclear are cheap."

"Conservation is our only weapon against rising energy prices. All other supplies cost more. And it is possible that growth in energy consumption could grow only half as fast as overall economic growth."

While other energy sources have organized supporters, in the form of the various industries conservation does not. "We have nothing to compare to the energy procedures in terms of marketing, distribution and lobbying," observed Sant. "The oil companies and utilities are busy talking up how much they need to produce. But no one's out there wholesaling conservation by the ton and barrel."

Even those who most vigorously advocate conservation step back from some of the means to that end. Sen. Edward Kennedy, for instance, has been one of the strongest supporters of conservation in the Congress. Yet he has fought hard against letting energy prices rise. But, without rising prices, people cannot be expected to take conservation seriously. And without bigger tax incentives, it is difficult to see how large numbers of people will be convinced to take the actions that do save energy.

But it is awfully hard for a liberal politician to say that we need moderate, manageable price rises now to avoid very sharp price rises later.

On the other hand, conservative politicians tend to refuse to even take conservation seriously as a major energy option.

Ironically, it seems that higher energy prices are necessary to get people to focus on conservation. The current increases in oil prices seem to be having that effect again, after several years of inattention.

Still, the United States, which uses a third of all energy used in the world every day, has yet to accept conservation, in its own right, as a serious energy source. ●

#### SALT VERIFICATION AND UNITED STATES-TURKEY RELATIONS

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, as the Senate begins its consideration of

the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT), several key issues will have to be reviewed very carefully. One of the major issues is the question of verification.

With the loss of U.S. verification facilities in Iran, the ability of the United States to verify Soviet compliance with the treaty has become an even more difficult question. One effect of the loss of Iran has been for the State Department to seek an arrangement with Turkey to provide the United States with increased verification capabilities.

In this regard, I wanted to bring an article from a recent edition of the New York Times to the attention of my colleagues. I think this article not only bears on the question of U.S. verification capabilities under SALT, but also raises some questions about the degree to which Turkey is willing to reciprocate for American cooperation in extending military and economic aid.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1979]  
ECEVIT CALLED IRATE ON SPY-FLIGHT PLEA

(By Nicholas Gage)

ANKARA, TURKEY.—Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit is furious at what he feels are efforts by Washington to put pressure on him to accept U-2 flights over Turkey to monitor missile tests in the Soviet Union, according to high Turkish officials.

Mr. Ecevit also remains at odds with the United States, the officials said, over his insistence that Moscow first give its consent to the U-2 flights. The Turkish Foreign Ministry disclosed recently that Turkey would allow the reconnaissance planes to fly over Turkey territory only if the Russians did not object.

American diplomats here say that some kind of tacit consent may come from the Russians because they are as eager for the new treaty limiting strategic arms to win Senate approval as the Carter Administration. But they feel that if Mr. Ecevit insists on formal Soviet consent he will not get it.

Asked what kind of an understanding he would like Moscow and Washington to reach on the flights, Deputy Prime Minister Hikmet Cetin said today that he wanted one that made it clear to the Turkish public that the Soviet Union did not object.

#### AFFECTS THE WHOLE COUNTRY

Mr. Cetin said that even if the Soviet Union gave its consent, there was no guarantee that Turkey would approve the U-2 flights, which the United States says are needed to compensate for the loss of electronic listening posts in Iran. "The Government as a whole will have to support it," he said, "the Security Council, perhaps even Parliament. This affects the whole country."

American diplomats here believe that while the new arms agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union does not directly involve Turkey, relations between Washington and Ankara will suffer if the U-2 flights are not allowed.

Turkish approval for the flights was formally asked by Deputy Secretary of State Warren M. Christopher at a meeting with Mr. Ecevit on May 8.

Mr. Ecevit reportedly replied that he could allow them only if Moscow gave its consent because he did not want to strain relations with the Soviet Union, which he has been carefully trying to improve since coming to power 18 months ago.

Mr. Christopher said that while the U-2 issue was an independent matter, it might affect Congressional attitudes toward economic aid to Turkey, according to aides of Mr. Ecevit and American diplomats.



## ECEVIT ERUPTED IN ANGER

At that point Mr. Ecevit is said to have erupted in anger, charging that Washington was trying to link permission for the flights with promised economic aid and saying that his Government would not tolerate such pressure. An American diplomat present at the meeting described Mr. Ecevit as "the angriest I've seen him since he became Premier."

The sources said Mr. Christopher assured the Prime Minister that he had not intended any linkage but was merely describing political realities in the United States. Mr. Ecevit's anger subsided.

Yesterday, the United States Senate approved a \$50 million grant to supply arms and military equipment to Turkey.

Mr. Ecevit's aides say the Prime Minister needs at least tacit approval from Moscow to justify permitting the flights because he has opposed the use of Turkish airspace for spy planes throughout his political career.

## UNDER PRESSURE FROM OPPOSITION

Mr. Ecevit is also under pressure from the opposition Justice Party, whose leader, Süleyman Demirel, has come out strongly against the flights. "Our position is final and clear," Mr. Demirel said during a speaking tour of the eastern provinces last week. "These flights are against Turkish interests." He reminded his listeners that he stopped U-2 flights into Soviet territory from Turkey when he was Prime Minister in 1965.

While the proposed flights would originate outside Turkey and would not penetrate Soviet airspace, Mr. Demirel charged that allowing them "will put us back where we started." Flights of U-2 planes from Turkey over the Soviet Union caused an international incident in 1960 when one of them was shot down. Its pilot, Francis Gary Powers, was captured and convicted of espionage by the Russians, who later released him in a prisoner exchange.

Mr. Ecevit's aides say that large segments of the Turkish public oppose U-2 flights of any kind over Turkey and that the Prime Minister, whose Government's popularity has declined as the country's economy has deteriorated, cannot afford to approve them without a sound explanation. Moscow's consent would provide him with that explanation. ●

## FORGING NEW ALLIANCES

## HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, for a long time, opponents of both the civil rights and environmental movements have sought to harm both by dividing them. Now, at long last, in a brilliant exposition, Vernon E. Jordan, Jr. (President of the National Urban League) has made clear how closely our futures are linked.

Mr. Jordan's arguments were contained in a most important article which appeared in the New York Times this past Sunday, May 27. In the article he points out that "the urban environment means more than air or water quality. It means economic and housing opportunities." But he also points out that black people have not been sufficiently concerned with the physical environment, stating: "Because of our poverty, because of our social and economic disadvantage, we suffer disproportionately

from the degraded physical environment."

I fully agree with Vernon Jordan that a "positive, caring alliance between the environmental movement and the civil rights movement" is essential to our Nation's future.

I urge all my colleagues to read this important article:

## FORGING NEW ALLIANCES

(By Vernon E. Jordan Jr.)

A positive, caring alliance between the environmental movement and the civil rights movement is not only possible, but necessary. Black people have suffered environmental damage ever since we were brought to these shores. The economic environment has placed us on the margins of society, locked into poverty and deprivation.

Today, the civil rights movement is first and foremost about the business of combating the polluted economic environment that affects black people.

We are also concerned with the social environment, an environment pervaded by discrimination, lack of access to housing, health care and educational opportunities.

Of necessity then, we have not been as concerned with the physical environment. We should be. Because of our poverty, because of our social and economic disadvantage, we suffer disproportionately from the degraded physical environment.

Black cancer rates are rising faster than those for whites. For some cancers, black rates are 50 percent more than for whites. It is no accident that cancer rates rise as blacks perform the dirtiest jobs in our society and are locked into the most polluted neighborhoods.

Black health figures document the effects of pollution and stress caused by the physical environment. Blacks suffer hypertension, heart and lung diseases and other physical and mental disorders directly traceable not only to the social and economic environment but also to the physical. We all must be concerned with the effects of airborne lead on learning disabilities affecting poor children in inner cities. And concern for saving wildlife must be matched by concern for eradicating urban wildlife like rats and vermin that plague the ghettos.

The urban environment means more than air or water quality. It means economic and housing opportunities. The cities have been victimized by public and private policies that undermine their viability.

The real urban crisis never was a fiscal crisis, it was a people crisis. Now, despite all the news reports of cities being revitalized or "gentrified," cities are still experiencing a people crisis.

Walk down Twelfth Street [in Washington, D.C.] and ask the proverbial man on the street what he thinks about the snail darter and you are likely to get the blankest look you've ever experienced. Ask him what he thinks the basic urban environment problem is, and he'll tell you jobs. I don't intend to raise the simple-minded equation of snail darters and jobs, but that does symbolize an implicit divergence of interests between some segments of the environmental movement and the bulk of black and urban people.

For black people, the problems of the economic environment are the most pressing.

This places a burden on our partners from government and from the private and non-profit sectors. A burden, in the sense that they will find in the black community absolute hostility to anything smacking of no-growth or limits-to-growth. Some people have been too cavalier in proposing policies to preserve the physical environment for themselves while other, poorer people pay the costs.

Advocates of solar and other renewable energy resources have spelled out in policy statements and in actual pilot programs how development of those energy sources would create jobs for unemployed, less-skilled workers.

We need more of that kind of approach.

We need to know what the employment impact would be for specific environmental-protection policies. We need to know who pays, and how much.

We need to know what the benefits will be.

And we will need to know why a specific policy has to be implemented now at the cost of jobs, rather than later, with fewer negative results.

The 1970's have been a time of gross political pollution, a time not just of Watergate, but of national withdrawal from social reform and social justice. This new negativism is evidenced by the poisonous attacks on affirmative action, on Federal social spending.

All are smeared—civil rights groups, environmentalists, labor and Government. And business perhaps suffers most from mindless condemnation. Investment is equated with exploitation, profits with greed, and efficiency with brutality.

Such attacks reflect ignorance of the working of our economy. They are the mirror image of charges that black seek dominance, government, unjustified power, and environmentalists, irrational control over our lives.

I think we have finally reached a point where all groups understand their futures are linked.

Black citizens understand we need to forge alliances with our colleagues in business, labor and the environmental movement, among others.

Government understands the need to reach out to those it is pledged to serve.

Business and labor understand their interdependence.

And environmentalists understand their concerns must be with the total human environment, and not narrow aspects of it. ●

THE MORAL EQUIVALENT OF  
INSANITY

## HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Carter administration embarked upon a crusade to convince the world that spent fuel elements from nuclear power reactors should be buried, unprocessed, supposedly to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Has this program of burying energy, a program I consider to be the moral equivalent of insanity, been successful? I would like to quote from a short article from the April 1979 issue of Nuclear Engineering International. I will include the article and a copy of the additional views I inserted in the fiscal year 1980 authorization report on the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1980.

Here are the key sentences:

Many of the problems connected with plutonium are well understood. Nevertheless the EEC Commission wants to increase the knowledge about plutonium as increasing quantities of the element will be recycled

in the community, reaching 20-30te (metric tons) annually by 1990. (Emphasis added)

There it is. The European Economic Community—our trading partners and NATO allies—is going to use its reactor plutonium wisely to generate electricity. I hope that before 1990 the national leaders of this country understand the real world around them. The article and additional views follow:

[From the Nuclear Engineering International, April 1979]

#### EEC LOOKS AT SAFER PLUTONIUM

BRUSSELS.—Two new five-year research programmes in important areas of nuclear technology have been agreed by the EEC Commission and forwarded to the Council of Ministers for approval.

One programme aims to increase safety in the use of plutonium as a nuclear fuel. Work on this began in 1975 and the preliminary results show that foreseeable radiation effects on workers and local inhabitants may well stay within the limits already in force.

Many of the problems connected with plutonium are well understood. Nevertheless the EEC Commission wants to increase the knowledge about plutonium as increasing quantities of the element will be recycled in the community, reaching 20-30te annually by 1990.

The second programme is connected with the management and storage of radioactive waste—"the most important multinational work currently taking place in the world" was how EEC Energy Commissioner Guido Brunner described it at a Brussels press conference in February. The research work will include pilot projects carried out as far as possible under real conditions.

Total cost of the two programmes is nearly \$110 million reflecting the urgency the EEC attaches to them.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

The Administration's budget request contained a line item request for project 77-13-1, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, Delaware Basin located in southeast New Mexico. An authorization and appropriation of \$55 million was requested for fiscal year 1980. The committee wisely reduced the amount requested to zero and, in addition, the committee reduced the amount previously authorized but not appropriated by \$30 million.

When first conceived and presented to the Congress in connection with the fiscal year 1977 budget, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) may have been a good idea. The concept of the project at that time was to demonstrate through research and development that radioactive waste generated by defense programs could be safely disposed of in underground salt beds. As a research and development facility for defense wastes, much could have been learned which would be applicable to the disposal of wastes from civilian power reactors after the reprocessing of nuclear fuels. Also, a wealth of information could have been gained which would be useful to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in the licensing of similar waste disposal activities in the future.

Unfortunately, basic decisions at the highest levels in the Executive Branch and in the Department of Energy (DOE) since April of 1977 have placed the WIPP and, in my opinion, the energy prospects of the United States in jeopardy. These policy decisions are:

That the United States will not reprocess the spent fuel from its commercial power reactors to recover the unspent uranium and plutonium contained in that fuel;

The United States has unsuccessfully urged all other countries to refuse to process spent fuels;

The United States has offered to accept

spent fuel, which it defines as "waste" from other countries which will be stored in some secure location under U.S. control;

As a result of these decisions, not a single reprocessing plant for reprocessing power reactor fuel is in operation in the U.S.

In connection with the fiscal year 1978 review of the Department of Energy budget request, the Department revealed plans to have this project licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission even though such action is not required by the law, and despite the consensus of all knowledgeable people that a licensed activity would be no more safe and no more acceptable to the opponents of nuclear power or of nuclear weapons than unlicensed government facilities.

It was also revealed that the Department had plans to dispose of up to 1,000 spent fuel assemblies in the WIPP facility. The DOE has no intention of ever recovering these spent fuel assemblies for reprocessing. In fact, after the assemblies are suitable packaged for burial, shipped thousands of miles and emplaced in salt, the economics of recovery for reprocessing would be such that the costs would exceed the value of the recovered fuels.

For a country facing an energy crisis which amounts to "the moral equivalent of war" a policy dictating the burial of recoverable energy resources contained within spent power reactor fuel amounts to the moral equivalent of insanity. It has been estimated that the energy resources represented by spent reactor fuels within the United States by the turn of the century will be equivalent to all of the oil reserves of Saudi Arabia—the equivalent of 240 billion barrels of oil.

The United States has been reprocessing fuel elements in connection with the nuclear weapons program for some 30 years. There is nothing mysterious about the technology, nor are there technological impediments to the processing of the waste products which result from reprocessing.

The policy of the United States toward the nuclear fuel cycle must change. The people, in my opinion, will soon begin to ask: "Why, if we are expected to live in cold and dark houses, suffering unemployment and inflation, because of an energy crisis, is our government burying enormous amounts of energy?" The crowd protesting such a policy should fill the Mall and Ellipse.

While the committee found other good reasons for refusing to authorize further appropriations for the WIPP, I believe that the refusal to contribute further to the absurdity of burying energy would have been enough.

ROBERT E. BADHAM. ●

#### SHATTER THE SILENCE, VIGIL 1979

#### HON. BALTAZAR CORRADA

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a participant in a project sponsored by our distinguished colleague, JIM HOWARD, called "Shatter the Silence, Vigil 1979." This project is a continuation of previous efforts aimed at improving emigration for Soviet Jews. Their plight has moved all of us to do as much as we can to seek ways in which their hope of emigrating from the Soviet Union will be realized.

Today I want to bring to your attention the name of Evgenia Lutskeya. Mrs. Lutskeya is a 56-year-old engineer from

Leningrad who wishes to emigrate to Israel to be with her daughter. She first applied for an exit visa 6 years ago and has been refused one for "security reasons." Mrs. Lutskeya, however, states that none of her work had been marked confidential and that, in any event, whatever projects she had worked on had been superseded by subsequent refinements and advancements in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all our colleagues to read Mrs. Lutskeya's own words in presenting her plight: "I express my hope that your interference will restore legality and justice, and I will be given permission to be reunited with my daughter."

It is my hope that Mrs. Lutskeya and other families in similar circumstances will be allowed to emigrate and I ask all my colleagues to join in prayer for them to attain this goal. ●

#### POPULATION PLANNING: WHAT OTHERS HAVE SAID AND THE UNITED STATES HAS NOT DONE

#### HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to nuclear plant accidents and the flash of media attention, the Congress and administration can become quick studies in the politics of crisis. But we are slow in learning to appreciate the need to plan for long-term domestic population changes that will affect the lives and well-being of millions of Americans.

More than 40 years ago the handwriting was on the political blackboard. President Franklin Roosevelt's National Resources Committee in 1938 recommended legislative and administrative actions "to shape the broad national policies regarding population problems." Since then, we have witnessed the rapid population growth and school shortages of the 1950's and early 1960's; the surge in the labor force and unemployment in the 1970's; mounting illegal immigration throughout the period and prospects for a larger proportion of older citizens in the future.

What we have not experienced is any progress in committing ourselves to planning ahead for population changes. This year the House Select Committee on Population has found:

The United States has no explicit policy outlining goals relating to the overall size, growth, and distribution of the population; and the benefits and disadvantages of those policies and programs that do affect the U.S. population are not assessed in terms of their impact on population.

There have been plenty of policy reminders in recent years. The 1972 Presidential Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended "that the Nation welcome and plan for a stabilized population." In 1974, the United States added its voice to the 1974 World Population Conference's call for all nations—



to consider adopting population policies, within the framework of socio-economic development, which are consistent with basic human rights and national goals and values.

Two years later, recognizing the need for a coordinated plan for U.S. response to global population growth, the President's National Security Council approved the first annual report on "U.S. International Population Policy." Throughout the decade, the U.S. Agency for International Development has assisted less developed countries to establish national policies aimed at reducing population growth.

Less developed countries have, indeed, followed our advice rather than our example. Back in 1960, only two nations—India and Pakistan—had government policies aimed at reducing population growth. Today, the governments of 35 less developed countries have established policies to plan for reduced population growth. Approximately 72 percent of the world's people live in less developed nations; of them, 78 percent live in countries with population growth reducing policies. They span the continents of Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

Such policies and their goals are not ends in themselves. As the 1974 World Population Conference states:

The promotion of development and the quality of life require coordination of action in all major socio-economic fields, including population which is the inexhaustible source of creativity and a determining factor of progress. . . . Policies whose aim is to affect population trends must not be considered substitutes for socio-economic development policies but integrated with those policies to facilitate the solution of certain problems facing developing and developed countries.

Planning for population changes is as important for the United States as it is in countries with more rapid rates of population growth. It is their impact on human and natural resources, not just people's numbers that counts. We in the United States lead the world in resource consumption—it magnifies tremendously the changes in our numbers, distribution, and age structure.

The U.S. population continues to grow, by about 2 million people annually. And our population is experiencing tremendous changes in its location throughout the country and in its age. Yet, we not only have no plan for these changes, we do not even have the wherewithal to begin to plan. According to the Select Committee on Population, the Federal Government does not even have the "capacity to plan systematically for population change; yet changes in the size, age composition, and geographical distribution of the population can, and often do, have profound effects on Federal policies."

"Development" is a relative thing. Less developed countries may be decades behind the United States in their industrial and economic development; but they are way ahead of us in planning for the future of their people through population policies. Congress can change that by debating and establishing a national population policy with the means to coordinate Federal efforts to plan for population changes. That is why I will be introducing legislation to declare a national population policy of stabilization and

a White House Office of Population Policy.●

#### IN MEMORIAM—JOSEPH KASELAK

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of notifying both you and my colleagues of the death of one of this Nation's most dedicated public servants—Mr. Joseph Kaselak. Mr. Kaselak died Sunday, May 27, 1979, in Cleveland.

For many years, Mr. Kaselak served as the executive secretary to Congressman CHARLES VANIK, of Ohio, from the 22d Congressional District in Cleveland. He was a bulwark in Cleveland politics.

Many of us remember Joseph Kaselak as a very vibrant personable individual who was also a dedicated and conscientious employee. Needless to say, he was a role model for his colleagues and associates.

However, he was much more than just a dedicated employee. He was a man with an unfaltering commitment to the well-being of the entire Cleveland community. He cared about people and loved Cleveland. Everyone who knew him would say that he was one of Cleveland's greatest assets.

The entire Cleveland community will miss Joseph Kaselak's vibrance, commitment, and foresight. He is a man who can never be replaced. We share the loss with his family.

Therefore, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the RECORD an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 29, 1979, about the demise of Joseph Kaselak:

JOSEPH KASELAK, TV'S CONVENTION CRASHER, IS DEAD

(By Carol L. Jordan)

Just about every four years since 1960, Joseph E. Kaselak was on national television, whether the networks wanted him or not.

While politicians plotted vote-getting strategy, Kaselak plotted strategy to get on the convention floor and then on to television.

Kaselak, 60, executive secretary for U.S. Rep. Charles A. Vanik, D-22, died Sunday evening at Fairview General Hospital.

Kaselak, of Lyndhurst, and his wife, Martha G., were visiting the Cleveland home of their daughter, Shirley A. Tancak, when he collapsed about 5:30 p.m. He was taken to Fairview General Hospital at 6 p.m. and died 18 minutes later.

An aide to Vanik since 1961, Kaselak ran the congressman's Cleveland office.

On convention floors throughout the years, Kaselak worked his way through the delegates to stand behind politicians and television reporters when the cameras were on.

During the 1964 convention in Atlantic City, President Lyndon B. Johnson handed out credentials to anyone who contributed \$1,000 or more. Kaselak borrowed a big-giver's pass.

In a 1976 Plain Dealer interview, Kaselak recalled that the giver told him, "I'm just lending this to you, Joe. I'd like to see you tomorrow." He didn't see me until two years later.

During that same convention, when the

late Frank McGee stood in front of the Ohio delegation to give a TV report, Kaselak stood behind him, moving his lips occasionally. One delegate inquired, "What's Frank McGee doing interviewing Joe Kaselak?"

During 1968, Kaselak soared above the chaos of rebellion in the streets of Chicago.

On the first night, he appeared on national TV six times. By the second night, he had become picky about his exposure.

"I only appear on the NBC network," he was quoted as saying to a reporter. "I like to get on, standing right next to Frank McGee. He's a pleasant man."

At the 1972 convention in Miami Beach, Kaselak wore a badge that said, "Photographer's Assistant." When someone said, "I didn't know you were a photographer," Kaselak said "I'm not. I assist."

Kaselak was considered such an outgoing man that he had a prominent part in Richard Reeves' book, "Convention," about the 1976 Democratic convention.

Even when he wasn't in front of the cameras, Kaselak was often on the scene of a political event.

In 1963, he was both a friend and supporter of Johnson when the vice president visited Cleveland for a Democratic steer roast.

Kaselak was the advance contact for Johnson's administrative assistant, Clifford Carter, got badges made and whipped together the auto-wagon train that greeted Johnson at the airport.

It was Kaselak who was trusted to tote around Johnson's own special collapsible chair and his vice presidential seal. And it was Kaselak that Johnson took along as his guide from the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland to Euclid Beach, and back to the airport.

This didn't mean that he wasn't a faithful John F. Kennedy man. He had 132 photographs of the late president visting here. One was of Kennedy shaking hands with Kaselak and Kaselak had it blown up to a 4- by 5-foot mural for display in his living room.

Kaselak grew up in the Buckeye area on Cleveland's East Side, according to his son, Dennis J., a Cleveland lawyer.

From 1950-57, he worked as a boilermaker, and from 1957-61 was chief inspector for the Ohio Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

He entered politics full time in 1961.

But, his son said, "He's always been involved in politics in some way."

"He was ward leader in the 30th Ward club in 1958, he was usually in charge of the motorcades for presidents that visited here, and he worked as a volunteer on some of Vanik's campaigns."

Vanik last night said Kaselak has been a "very loyal and devoted member of my staff as well as a very good friend."

"He appeared where I couldn't. He made it his point to know people in the news media and in political circles. He was a person who reached out to meet other people."

Service will be Thursday at the Rybicki & Son funeral home, 4640 Turney Rd., Garfield Hts.

In addition to his wife, daughter, and son, he is survived by his parents, Paul and Elizabeth Kaselak; two brothers and three grandchildren.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO PAUL KELLERBLOCK

### HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I share with you the recent loss of a good friend and

loyal Nevadan—Paul Kellerblock of Las Vegas.

During his 79 years, Paul involved himself in numerous business, community, social, and church activities. But his strongest dedication was to serving Jesus Christ.

He was most proud of his involvement in the building of the Twin Harbor Baptist Church in Westport, Wash., and also of his work within the University Presbyterian Church in Seattle, Wash.

The existence of the Twin Harbor Church is almost entirely due to Paul's initiative and hard work. Known as the "Miracle Church of the Northwest," it was completed at a cost of only \$23,000 in the late 1950's. Its assessed value at the time of completion was \$96,000. Paul bought the materials, hauled them in his own truck from Seattle to Westport, and supervised the building of the church.

His deep down interest in the Lord's work continued when he moved to Las Vegas. He actively supported the Child Evangelism Fellowship and the Navigators.

Paul Kellerblock died in a Las Vegas hospital last month, after a short illness. But his spirit lives on in the memories of his family and friends.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. WEBSTER PENDERGRASS

#### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1979, Dr. Webster Pendergrass will retire as vice president of the University of Tennessee after a long and distinguished career. Over the years, Dr. Pendergrass has made outstanding contributions to Tennessee as an educator and as an agriculturist. Our State will sorely miss his strong leadership and dedication.

Ag Institute News, the publication of the University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture, announced his retirement in its March-April 1979 issue. I insert this article at this point in the RECORD:

DR. WEBSTER PENDERRASS TO RETIRE—YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE INSTITUTE

Webster Pendergrass, longtime leader and friend of agriculture in Tennessee, will retire as Vice President effective June 30, 1979.

Dr. Pendergrass first came to the University of Tennessee in 1931 as a student and remembers when the entire faculty of the Institute was housed in Morgan Hall and the enrollment at Knoxville was less than 3000 students. Through the years he has served as assistant county agent, county agent, Instructor of Agronomy, Extension Agronomist, Dean of Agriculture, Vice Chancellor, and Vice President.

He said he feels fortunate to have been involved in agriculture during a period of time when so much progress has been made. He has seen such developments as hybrid corn, high analysis fertilizers, great increases in milk production per cow, changes in beef cattle type, and the replacement of mules with mechanized equipment. Dr. Pendergrass was directly involved in the first major soil conservation program initiated in Tennessee.

In spite of the great changes he has seen, Dr. Pendergrass says many of the original teaching methods used by the Extension Service are a valid part of today's programs.

As assistant and county agent, Dr. Pendergrass' expertise and accomplishments in erosion control and crop production caught the attention of agricultural leaders as well as farmers. He provided leadership in establishing both structural and vegetative erosion control measures.

He continued to provide outstanding leadership as an Extension Agronomist. In this position, he was responsible for expanding the Soil Testing Laboratory which analyzes soil samples and makes fertilizer recommendations for farmers throughout the state. He initiated the "Keep Tennessee Green" program, worked with groups and agencies serving Tennessee agriculture to adopt uniform seeding recommendations, and set up a pasture and forage production program to provide high quality feed throughout the year. These activities resulted in an increase in quality of pastures and forages which was followed by a great upsurge in beef cattle production. His background and leadership in grassland farming influenced the selection of Tennessee for the second National Grassland Field Day and Conference.

The Institute of Agriculture has made marked advances under Dr. Pendergrass' leadership; the undergraduate and graduate curricula has been expanded and upgraded, doctoral programs have been established, and the departments of Food Technology and Science, Forestry, Wildlife, and Fisheries, and Agricultural Biology have been added. Three new buildings have been constructed on the agriculture campus, and another will be under construction in the summer of 1979.

In order to fill a growing need for veterinarians in the state and to provide expanded opportunities for students, Dr. Pendergrass worked to establish the College of Veterinary Medicine on the Institute campus.

Concerned about the declining number of students entering the UT College of Agriculture, he created the office of assistant dean (now Assistant Vice President), with student recruitment and scholarship fund-raising as the main responsibilities. This step quickly produced results with an increase in the enrollment from a low of about 400 in 1964 to near 2000 in 1977-78. During this period more than 3000 scholarships were awarded.

After becoming Dean, Dr. Pendergrass established a business office for the Institute to provide budgeting and financial control and took the lead in procuring additional funds to upgrade salaries of extension, research, and teaching personnel to attract and keep highly qualified staff members.

The Institute of Agriculture has undergone considerable reorganization and revision under Pendergrass' leadership. Departments have been realigned, a new college fitted into the organization structure, provisions to insure closer coordination between teaching, research, and extension fostered. Extension district supervisory force enlarged and a county office hierarchy established. Accompanying these changes have been selection and development of a staff with an increased level of training and higher degree of competence.

4-H Club Training Centers have been greatly improved with major new facilities built at three of the four centers. The other center is being completely rebuilt at this time.

Numerous and rapid developments have taken place in the research programs and facilities of the UT Agricultural Experiment Station. The Milan Field Station was established, the Plant Science farm, the USDA cotton farm, and Holston farm were

added to the Knoxville Station, a 2,000 acre forest and Arboretum developed at Oak Ridge, a Forestry Field Station obtained at Tullahoma, and the joint UT-Atomic Energy Commission Research program at Oak Ridge strengthened. The farm at Martin became a unit of the Agricultural Experiment Station and a number of the agriculture faculty became staff members of the station. Two swine testing stations and a bull testing station were added to provide swine breeders and beef breeders with top quality foundation animals.

In summing up the accomplishments and advances that have been made in the Institute during his years as an administrator, Dr. Pendergrass acknowledged the leadership and cooperation of President Holt, President Boling, the Board of Trustees, the Governor, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, and a group of dedicated and capable administrators, faculty and staff.

In appreciation for his outstanding work with the Institute of Agriculture, Dr. Pendergrass has received many honors, including the Progressive Farmer Man of the Year Award, Citation For Outstanding Service to 4-H Award, County Agents Distinguished Service Award, and the Omega Chapter of Epsilon Sigma Phi Distinguished Service Award.

After retiring from his work with the Institute, Dr. Pendergrass said he plans to remain in Knoxville. He said he will travel, hunt, fish, play golf, and become more involved in the operation of his farm in Pickett County. He will complete his assignment on the Rotary International Health, Hunger, and Humanity Committee and continue his responsibility as a Director of the International Fertilizer Development Center.●

#### HIGH SCHOOL COACH HONORED

#### HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding gentleman from my district, Mr. Clarence Turner, a coach at Camden High School in Camden, N.J.

On Friday, May 25, 1979, relatives, friends and associates honored Clarence for his outstanding achievements.

Clarence Turner, son of Marie and John Turner, is a native of Dunn, N.C. He completed his secondary education in Wadesboro, N.C., attended Johnson C. Smith University in Charlotte on a football and basketball scholarship and played all 4 years on varsity teams.

He played basketball under the tutelage of Cal Irvin, one of the great black coaches of America, whose record ranked high among coaches of both black and white colleges.

While attending Johnson C. Smith University, Clarence played professional baseball with the Negro American League's Indianapolis Clowns, who were world champions for 4 consecutive years. His teammates were such great players as Hank Aaron and Satchel Paige. He played against great players like Junior Gilliam, Ernie Banks, and Francisco Herrera.

Clarence graduated from Johnson C. Smith with a Bachelor of Science degree in physical education.



In the fall of 1953, while playing with Indianapolis, Clarence had the opportunity to play with Jackie Robinson's All Star Team which barnstormed through the South and Mexico, playing with such late greats as Jackie Robinson, Gil Hodges, and Luke Easter. Other players were Bobby Young, Ralph Branca and a young man destined to become famous—Maury Wills.

Clarence was later signed by the then Brooklyn Dodgers and played in their farm system for 5 years as a pitcher. An injured arm forced him to give up playing baseball.

Clarence spent 2 years—1954–1955—in the U.S. Army as a medic at the Valley Forge Army Hospital working in physical therapy.

In 1956 he came to Camden and commenced work as a substitute teacher and postal clerk. Later he was contracted to teach on a regular basis. He has taught at Cooper-Grant, Camden Junior, Sumner, H. B. Wilson, Parkside and Lanning Square schools. He came to Camden High School in 1966 as head baseball coach and assistant basketball coach. He was named head basketball coach in 1968 after 2 years as an assistant.

Coach Turner now serves as department chairman of the men's division—physical education and head basketball coach at Camden High School.

In his nine seasons as head basketball coach, Clarence has compiled a 209 to 34 record. This enviable record is the best of any active coach in south Jersey. We here acclaim Clarence Turner to be the best in the State.

Clarence is married to the former Sharon Foreman of Chicago, Ill., who also graduated from his alma mater. The Turner's have a 6-year-old son named Eric.●

#### MODEL CONGRESS

### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to observe 200 young, dedicated students, along with their school counselors, demonstrate convincingly that interest in government and how it works is very much alive. I attended part of a 2-day model congress held the weekend of May 26 at Jamaica High School in Queens, coordinated by Arnold Feinblatt.

I watched these young people organize themselves into caucuses and committees, debate the merits of potential legislation, and amend it. I have to say in all candor that the speed and dispatch of this student congress made me slightly envious. Those of us who serve in the real thing deliberate at a much slower pace, I am afraid.

But what was most impressive is that these youngsters participated in this event not on schooltime but during the weekend when they could have been out doing other things. They were there then

not because it was part of a school function but because they wanted to be there. They wanted to participate and to learn and to be a part of the governmental process, even if it was just pretend.

It is exactly that sort of enthusiasm and interest in government that we need to keep this Nation free and independent. It is exactly when the people of this Nation take a firm and committed interest in their government that it works best. What we need to do as a nation, it seems to me, is to find a way of transfusing that youthful enthusiasm to the rest of our citizens, including that 50 percent or so of eligible voters who tend not to exercise their rights.

These high school students were not just going through a meaningless exercise. They were involved; they were prepared to discuss the major questions of the day and they conducted themselves with dignity as they moved through their model congress.

I would hope that this custom started by Jamaica High School would spread around the Nation. It is one of those activities that requires special effort by everyone involved, and it is one of those activities that is totally worth all the effort.●

#### VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK TRIBUTE

### HON. DAN LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1979

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war has been over for 6 years now, but we are still feeling the pain of its scars.

One of the most unfair side effects of that conflict's agony is that the Vietnam veterans—those who fought in good faith and completed their service honorably—have yet to be recognized and honored by our society for their sacrifices.

Never before have our soldiers returned home from a war and been treated to such shame and humiliation. Some would like us to believe that only those who were too stupid or too poor to avoid or evade the draft went to Vietnam.

This stereotype is not only unfair, but untrue.

A young Vietnam veteran wrote the Washington Post in 1977:

In candor, I never knew what to think of the war either; never knew, even while I was there . . . I believed explicitly only in this: The Government should be able to raise and deploy troops in accordance with decisions properly made in the national interest.

In other words, this soldier went to Vietnam because it was his proper duty, simply that.

This attitude characterized the majority of those who served in Vietnam.

Of the 8.5 million veterans of the Vietnam conflict—only about 20 percent were drafted. The rest, 6.7 million, were volunteers.

And the overwhelming majority served honorably in circumstances far more difficult than most Americans realize.

The Vietnam-era soldier put in longer service than those in other wars. The average soldier in World War II served 30 months away from his home and family. The average Vietnam soldier served 34 months.

The ferocity of the Vietnam War has also gone unrecognized.

There were 20,000 more American Marine Corps casualties in Vietnam than in all of World War II.

Some Marine units, in fact, faced casualty rates of 150 percent.

And two-thirds of those wounded or killed in Vietnam were volunteers.

There is another side of the heroism of Vietnam veterans to which not enough attention has been paid—the courage of those captured and imprisoned during the war.

A recent book, "A History of Prisoners of War From 1964 to 1973," tells with great poignancy the valor of American POWs held in Vietnam.

These men, imprisoned under terrible conditions and deprivations for years, gave each other comfort, held fast to their convictions and withstood terrible punishments. Yet, they never renounced their country and throughout their ordeal maintained ingenious methods of communicating with each other in order to give their comrades emotional support.

Few of our fighting men have ever been called upon to endure such terrible ordeals.

Yet what was the fate of these men when they came home?

While military service was the norm for young men in World War II, it was the exception for young men in the sixties.

So those who did fight in Vietnam came home feeling more isolated than returning soldiers ever felt before.

Moreover, studies have shown that it was those combat veterans who had good records and high expectations who suffered the worst from negative stereotyping which greeted them upon their return.

These men thought they did a good job and expected to be treated accordingly.

I think they have yet to receive the tribute due them.

Last year, Congress made a start in this direction when it authorized a special bronze plaque honoring the Vietnam war soldiers to be placed at the Tomb of the Unknowns in Arlington Cemetery.

And this year, the President and the Congress have declared May 28–June 3, Vietnam Veterans Week.

These small tributes do not represent employment opportunities, educational benefits or health care for our veterans—but they do represent something virtually important.

They symbolize the willingness of the Congress and the National Government to finally own up to their responsibility to accept, honor and respect the Vietnam veteran.

It is long overdue.●

## BANK ILLIQUIDITY

## HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of every Member of the Congress, especially the members of the Senate and House Banking Committees, to an article by Elgin Groseclose that recently appeared in Gold Newsletter.

Based upon a speech given by Mr. William M. Isaac, a Director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Dr. Groseclose's article is very frightening and deserves investigation. If the statistics used by Mr. Isaac are correct, then we are in for some very bad times. Meanwhile the subcommittees charged with oversight of the banking system sit and do nothing. Perhaps, after reading this article, they will hold some oversight hearings on our fractional reserve banking system before the whole house of cards comes crashing down around our ears.

The article follows:

## BANK ILLIQUIDITY: ANOTHER CRASH AHEAD?

(By Elgin Groseclose, Ph. D.)

From time to time we have discussed the deterioration of the official money and standard of value, the provision of which is a Constitutional function of Congress—how the money system that once consisted almost entirely of gold and silver coins, now is nothing more than irredeemable paper notes and debased metal shillings. We now invite attention to the deterioration of the other principal form of money in use; that is, "check book money," which has become the common medium of payments and store of value.

## THE STATUS OF CHECK BOOK MONEY

Checking accounts are the deposit liabilities—the IOU's—of commercial banks. The ability of the banks to meet their deposit liabilities is therefore of prime importance to the economic health of the country. Yet no set of facts is more generally overlooked, or ignored than the deterioration of bank equities which support the liquidity of bank liabilities.

The deposits of bank customers are secured by the assets of the banks. These consist mainly of other IOU's (debt obligations of others, including the U.S. government and the Federal Reserve banks), some cash, and the bankers' own capital. (Protection against loss to depositors is also guaranteed to limited extent by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.)

The purpose of the bankers' capital is to guarantee that the assets will always be equal to the deposit liabilities by absorbing any losses from bad loans or decline in their market value. Banks supposedly protect their assets by lending only where the risks are minimal, and to the extent that they take on greater risks the need for a larger capital cushion arises.

## SOME ALARMING STATISTICS

A paradox of the banking business is that while banks would hardly lend to a borrower whose balance sheet showed demand liabilities several times quick assets, or total debt several times proprietor's capital, such ratios are accepted with equanimity in banking. But not entirely.

In an address to the 85th annual convention of the Florida Bankers Association on March 16, 1979, Mr. William M. Isaac, a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, cites some figures which are alarming as they stand, but more so if from an historical perspective one projects these trends only a little way into the future.

In 1945, Mr. Isaac points out, the risk assets of the banking system—meaning by risk, total assets less so-called riskless assets like U.S. government obligations, cash and deposits with the Federal Reserve banks—were only 22 per cent of total assets, but by 1965 were 68 per cent and 80 per cent in 1978.

After pointing out the added effect upon the soundness of assets coming from the rising inflation rate, Mr. Isaac commented, "One would think that with banks assuming a greater degree of risk, and the economy becoming more volatile, capital ratios would be increasing. In fact, just the opposite occurred. The ratio of equity capital to risk was approximately 30 per cent at the turn of the century . . . After World War II the ratio steadily declined to 14½ per cent in 1960, 11.3 per cent in 1970, and approximately 8 per cent last year."

The thinning was most evident in largest banks, those with assets of over \$5 billion, for which the ratio was 6 per cent as against 10 per cent for banks with assets of less than \$100 million.

## CASHING THE CHIPS

Added to the equity cushion, of course, is the guarantee provided by the FDIC, which currently holds assets of some \$9 billion, or about 1.15 percent of insured deposits—not a great protection against a general bank run.

As any visitor to Las Vegas is aware, the batteries of roulette and blackjack tables would find few players if there were not a banker to redeem the chips in good cash. Good cash? What is that? Should your bank fail and the FDIC pay off your deposit from its insurance fund, what would you receive? Unfortunately, more chips. That is, Federal Reserve notes which are but pieces of paper redeemable in other like pieces of paper. While they are good to the extent that they are legal tender in payment of taxes and debts, that legal tender ends at the water line.

What are the chances of all the players going to the cashier with their chips? How many banks would have to fail before a general panic overtook the country and everyone rushed to convert their deposits into cash? Obviously, the \$9 billion reserve held by the FDIC would pay off only 1.15 cents on the dollar for insured deposits, and all deposits are not insured. More to the point, foreigners hold in U.S. banks some \$50 billion in claims (net of banks' foreign assets) and in a bank run they would like something more than Federal Reserve notes—gold, in short.

Mr. Isaac cites the uncomfortable fact of the continuing tension upon the officials and agencies responsible for the proper conduct of banking, drawn between the "differing perspectives and conflicting goals of shareholders, depositors, management and regulators."

## THE HISTORIC PARALLEL

The gravity of the problem can be highlighted by the number of bank failures. "During the past 5 years," Mr. Isaac reports, "we have witnessed the eleven largest bank failures in the history of the FDIC. At present the FDIC is administering some \$2 billion in assets of failed banks." Even more disturbing is a comparison with data for the years leading to the Crash of 1929 and the severest depression in U.S. history. In the 14 years from 1914 to 1931, net deposit liabilities of

Federal Reserve member banks increased from \$7½ billion to \$32 billion, or more than 30 percent. Meantime, as a result of official actions to reduce reserve requirements, the reserves held by the banks in 1931 were only \$2.9 billion instead of the minimum of \$4.4 billion that would have been required under the old national bank act.

## CORPORATE LIQUIDITY ALSO STRAINED

But the evidence of a debt ridden, mortgaged economy does not stop with the banking system. Standard measures of corporate liquidity reflect increasing strain. At 1978 yearend the cash ratio of all non-financial corporations, according to the compilations of the First Pennsylvania Corporation, stood at 27 percent compared with 34 percent in 1976. By "cash ratio" is meant the ratio of all cash and equivalents to current liabilities. By other balance sheet measures, U.S. corporations are less liquid than in 1974. For all non-financial corporations the current ratio—current assets divided by current liabilities—is now down to 1.59 compared to 1.63 in 1974 and 1.69 in 1976.

The First Pennsylvania economists point out with the current low levels of liquidity even a mild recession could bring about a "step up in the level of bankruptcies, which will more likely appear in 1980 than in 1979".

## TWO SUCCESSFUL BLACK CLEVELAND COMPANIES

## HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride that I take this opportunity to announce that two Cleveland businesses have been listed among the top 100 black companies in this country by Black Enterprise magazine. The aforementioned successful firms are S.T.R., Inc., and Royal Ridge Management Co., Inc., respectively.

This achievement should not be minimized. Even though the Federal Government has instituted numerous programs to stimulate minority businesses in this country, few are thriving and enjoying any significant level of prosperity. Additionally, with the increasing attention drawn to minority front operations, it is especially gratifying to know that black-owned and operated firms possess the management skills and capabilities to succeed.

Collectively, S.T.R., Inc., owned by Mr. Steve Rogers, and Royal Ridge Management Co., Inc., headed by Mr. Narlie Roberts, grossed in excess of \$15 million last year. These highly reputable businesses are exemplary of the potential of minority firms as well as serve as a credit to the city of Cleveland.

Both myself and the Cleveland area community commend these two businesses on their achievement.

Therefore, at this time I would like to submit an article about the success of these two firms which appeared in the May 30, 1979, issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer into the RECORD.

The article follows:



## TWO CLEVELAND FIRMS GET ON LIST OF TOP BLACK COMPANIES

(By John Leo Koshar)

Two Cleveland companies are among seven Ohio firms listed among the nation's top black businesses in the June issue of Black Enterprise magazine.

The Cleveland firms are S.T.R. Inc., a supermarket company headed by Steve Rogers, which had 1978 revenues of \$11.02 million, and Royal Ridge Management Co. Inc., headed by Narlie Roberts, which grossed \$4.3 million in the fast-food business.

Founded in 1965, S.T.R. operates four supermarkets in Cleveland with a total of 167 employees. But Rogers said his payroll will be increasing soon because he is taking over operation of two former A&P supermarkets which were closed here recently.

Headquartered at 17315 Miles Ave., S.T.R. was 26th on the national list of top black enterprises.

Royal Ridge, founded in 1970, operates a string of six McDonald's restaurants in Cleveland, East Cleveland and in Cleveland Heights and has two under construction—one in Cleveland Heights and one at Playhouse Square. It employs a total of 385. The company, headquartered in the Leader Building, was 98th on the magazine's list.

The other Ohio companies on the list include: Raleigh Guice Oldsmobile-Cadillac Inc., Fairfield, \$9.8 million, 29th; Tynes Chevrolet-Cadillac Inc., Delaware, \$9.7 million, 31st; Starnes Chevrolet Inc., Lima, \$7.6 million, 50th; Civic Ford Inc., Canton, \$6.6 million, 62; B&T Metals Co., Columbus, \$5 million, 88th.

Starnes and Civic were newcomers to the top 100 listing.

The magazine also reported that, for the first time last year, the nation's 49 black banks, up from a total of 47 a year earlier, had combined assets in excess of \$1 billion.

The banks included two Ohio financial institutions, First Bank NA, Cleveland, ranked 9th among black banks in the nation, and Unity State Bank, Dayton, listed 39th.

First Bank ended the year with assets totaling \$40.8 million. Unity State Bank had total assets of \$8 million. ●

## MIDEAST PEACE

### HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's favorable passage of the Special International Security Assistance Act of 1979, providing assistance to Israel and Egypt in order to implement their historic peace agreement, is a good time to pause and assess the prospects for peace in that troubled part of the world.

With the peace treaty signing, the first real steps toward achieving peace in the Middle East have been taken. We in the United States should be proud of our role in this process and that of our President. All of us and, I am sure, peace-loving people throughout the world look upon this occasion with great joy.

The initial peace treaty certainly must be considered a remarkable accomplishment. And so long as there exists an honest and determined resolve to uphold its provisions, it is an accord of historic proportions. Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat merit the highest praise for their valiant efforts in striving to bring about this first step toward peace.

And obviously, President Carter is to be commended for his unrelenting determination to bring the parties together in an agreement.

It must always be remembered, however, that the Mideast is a very fragile area, which has historically been fraught with upheaval and change. The recent fall of the pro-Western, pro-Israeli Government in Iran, and its replacement by what is currently an unstable regime that has embraced the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization and tolerated barbaric notions of justice, is an example of just how quickly and dramatically a given situation can change.

While we should welcome the increasingly friendly ties with the peace-seeking nation of Egypt, we must also remember that Israel remains our oldest, closest, and most trusted ally in the Middle East. In the past, so-called legal agreements have not been enough to insure the security of the Jewish State from the threats of hostile neighbors.

Egypt's efforts for peace unfortunately cannot be held up as an example of the way that all Arabs feel toward the Jewish people today. Indeed, while it is not often publicly talked about, or reported in the news headlines about the Mideast, Jews in Syria today continue to suffer from persecution. This kind of persecution has always been a terrible fact of life for Jews in the Middle East, and the United States must strive to end it because of this problem, and also because of Syria's overt efforts to hurt the progress of the peace process, a number of my colleagues and I voted against sending any U.S. foreign aid to Syria.

Therefore, while I feel that we should continue to encourage the peace process to move forward, we must remain cautious and vigilant in our approach.

A peace treaty between Israel and Egypt gives the United States a stronger strategic position in the region. This treaty can serve as the basis for developing a new coalition in the area between U.S. backed pro-Western nations. The United States should work to promote and better stabilize this new coalition as a stronghold against Soviet aggression—which should be recognized as the single greatest threat to the region.

I am hopeful that Saudi Arabia and Jordan will now become more constructively involved in furthering the peace process. We have certainly gone to great pains to make it clear to them that the United States is interested in maintaining a close and supportive relationship. Yet, very little has resulted from our efforts. The Saudis and Jordanians must understand that our relationship with them is a two-way street. I think it is time that both countries demonstrate their willingness to reciprocate by actively joining the peace initiative.

Finally, I am concerned by the effect on the peace process of what I would call "media diplomacy." We can never be sure how to evaluate the course of events that have been shaped by the clever use of the media, or, as is often the case, by the media itself. For that reason, I believe it is misleading and, in fact, could be detrimental, for people to

place too much stock in the day-to-day characterization of Mideast events by the media. I, frankly, grew weary of hearing one day that peace was at hand, and the next, that peace was lost. These reports translate into a roller coaster of public perception that only places an additional unnecessary pressure on all of the parties involved in the peace process. As a result we find Sadat and Begin in a position of vying for public opinion, rather than searching for ways to come to an agreement. I believe that President Carter also became engulfed in media diplomacy to the extent that he became involved in notions of popularity, or in pointing his finger at either side. Let us hope that these less substantive matters are not too great an influence on future peace efforts.

I am hopeful about the new prospects for a meaningful peace. The dark cloud that has covered this region of the world for so many years may have finally been pierced by a ray of sunlight. We should continue to strive toward the day when all of the Middle East will bask in the sunshine of peace. Yet, we must approach this great task with both determination and an ever watchful eye, to insure that the peace we seek will be a lasting one. ●

## REGISTRATION AND THE DRAFT

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, the Honorable BOB CARR and the Honorable PAT SCHROEDER, attached some eloquent views on registration and the draft to the report of the Committee on Armed Services on the fiscal year 1980 Department of Defense Authorization Act.

These views deserve sober consideration from every Member of this House, and I would like to bring excerpts from them to the attention of our colleagues. The excerpts follow:

#### THE DRAFT

(By BOB CARR and PAT SCHROEDER)

The committee's proposal for registration of 18-year-old males strikes us as one of the less well adjusted policy decisions we have made in quite some time. We have overstepped our bounds; we have exceeded the jurisdiction of this bill. We are here to authorize funds to buy weapons systems and set force levels, not to blight the future of this country's young men. A decision of this magnitude should be taken up by this committee in a separate piece of legislation, sequentially referred and considered, after all the proposals are laid before us and a healthy public debate has voiced the views of the people \* \* \*

However, even if we do treat the essential issue of selective service as an afterthought to the authorization process, we have other qualms over this solution to the problems of the all-volunteer force. Proponents of "only registration" are pulling the wool over the eyes of the American youth. The argument was made that registration of 18-year-olds would fill the "gaping holes in our deterrent" left by shortcomings in the All-Volunteer Force. Given that a list of names amounts to not much more than an easily blown over

stack of papers, the next plea we're going to hear from Mr. White's subcommittee is that these rosters need to be transformed into potentially ready forces. And then we're right back where we were with the previous Selective Service structure—laden with inadequacies, inefficiencies, and inequities. The American people should not be lulled to sleep by this talk of "only registration"—it's the Selective Service trap.

The case for stepping into the trap is unpersuasive at best. Even advocates of the draft admit the voluntary system is working well for the regular forces. The problem, they tell us, is the lack of a club with which to drive young men to enlist in the Reserves and National Guard. Consider now that we did not use the Reserves or Guard in Korea, and we did not use them in Vietnam. Where, then, is the evidence suggesting we will ever use them? Where is this evidence so persuasive that it justifies a major alteration of the fabric of our free society?

Consider also the two most probable military contingencies we face:

First, there is the "flashpoint war", arising quickly and escalating sharply into a massive conflict with rapid depletion of consumables and high loss of life, leading either to nuclear conflagration or to an exhausted cease-fire within a few weeks of initiation. No draft system can produce combat-capable forces with sufficient speed to influence the outcome of this type of conflict.

Second, there is the "slow boil" war, arising out of prolonged and ever-heightening international tension, with a year or more elapsing between the first significant storm clouds and the initiation of large-scale conflict. In this case, Congress can respond instantly by establishing a draft, using Social Security and Internal Revenue Service records as the basis for registration. We have shown our capability for instant response before, in such major crises as the National Football League television blackouts.

It is certainly possible to conjecture other scenarios in which registration would be of marginal utility, but the foregoing second scenario is already at the outer edge of probability; other scenarios, while possible, are even less probable \* \* \*.

Finally, on the more substantive issue of the language of the proposal itself, evidence of the poorly prepared nature of the amendment is its ambiguities. After having studied the text, it is still unclear what it is that we are asking Congress to consider. The limits of this "registration scheme" are undefined. Conceivably, these vagaries could lead not only to subjecting 18-year-olds to physicals, but to classification as well, involving time lost from work and other penalties even for those not chosen. Moreover, we have not authorized any money for this task of registration; we have handed the Appropriations Committee a blank check to institute this plan with whatever financial authority they choose, even though the funding and facilities to carry out physicals and classification will be substantial. We have, in effect, not served our primary task—to give monetary direction, on a line item basis, to our companion committees. We are encouraging a gross misuse and misallocation of taxpayers' funds.

#### THE OLD AND THE YOUNG

The committee proposal would register every American male who passes his 18th birthday after the next election, would keep him registered for life, and would exempt from registration all those who slip past their 18th birthday before the election.

Thus, the committee proposal is the ultimate, ninety-nine to the ninety-ninth power pure example of one group of people dumping a major burden upon the lives of a second group while exempting itself entirely from the consequences of this burden and denying the second group any control over what is done to it. In short, the committee is saying, "Let's you and him fight."

This is immoral, unwarranted, and inexcusable. While these three adjectives may fairly be applied to many government actions, let us also note that it is not justified by national security concerns.

Only a small minority of positions in a modern defense establishment require physical vigor. A 35-year-old Congressman, a 39-year-old Congresswoman, and even a 70-year-old committee chairman can fill a supply clerk or cook's helper position every bit as well as can an 18-year-old recruit. The only conceivable reasons for confining the burden of registration to the young are (a) it would be too inconvenient for us older folks and (b) we geezers have the power and the kids don't.

If we are unsuccessful at killing the whole operation, we intend to give every Member the opportunity to let his constituents and future constituents know where he stands on this issue. ●

#### THE ENERGY DEPARTMENT: A BAD IDEA GONE HAYWIRE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

O Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Washington Post Magazine on Sunday, May 20, entitled: "The Creation of Energy."

This article, authored by Garrett Epps insightfully points out why the Department of Energy is such a disaster, or, as the article is subtitled: "Why Our Newest Cabinet Department Is Without Form and Void."

This article is a sobering recitation of the DOE's several critical failures: failures in organization, failures in administration, failures in concept and policy, and most especially, failures in leadership.

Mr. Speaker, it has long been clear to me that the first essential step in changing this gloomy litany of DOE's failures must be new leadership at the very top. It has long been clear that Secretary Schlesinger must be replaced. That act alone will not solve DOE's problems, but until he is replaced it is clear that DOE will remain the disaster area it has been from the day of its creation.

The text of the article follows:

THE CREATION OF ENERGY  
WHY OUR NEWEST CABINET DEPARTMENT IS  
WITHOUT FORM AND VOID

(By Garrett Epps)

In the beginning was the Federal Power Commission. Then came the atom bomb, which begat the Atomic Energy Commission, which begat the Energy Research and Development Administration. And the Arabs embargoed their oil, which begat the Federal Energy Office, which begat the Federal Energy Administration.

Then Jimmy Carter took these elements and begat the Department of Energy. "No agency, anywhere in the federal government, has the broad authority needed to deal with our energy problems in a comprehensive way," said Carter in his message to Congress proposing the new department. "The legislation I am submitting today will bring immediate order to this fragmented system."

The Energy Department, child of this confusion, firstborn of Carter's pledge to reorganize the federal government from top to

bottom, came into being Oct. 1, 1977. More than a year and a half later, the promised order is nowhere to be seen. The Department of Energy is without form and void.

There is unquestionably a secretary of energy, the formidable James Schlesinger—former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Defense, veteran of the Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations, perhaps Washington's most remarkable bureaucratic survivor.

There is also, in broad outlines, a Carter-Schlesinger energy policy, which can be roughly stated as follows: the world is rapidly running out of oil. New discoveries, such as Alaskan and Mexican fields, do not alter this fact. America needs more energy every year to maintain its economic position and standard of living. In the long run, technologies like fusion and solar power will fill the gap. But in the next 25 years, America must rely less and less on oil; oil prices will and should rise more each year. Until the new technologies are ready, the country must depend on nuclear power and various uses of coal.

The combination of spokesman and policy has proved sweepingly unpopular in the country. Schlesinger's unemotional, pipe-smoking style has made him the most visible—and probably the most widely disliked—member of the Carter Cabinet; and the policy, which Carter recently stated as "use less oil and pay more for it," has outraged voters and liberal congressmen, who bomb Schlesinger at almost every opportunity. White House sources insist that Carter has faith in Schlesinger and believes that his unpopularity stems from popular resistance to facing hard facts about energy. But a secretary and a policy—popular or not—do not constitute a functioning agency; and as a cabinet department, rather than an uneasy melding of three bureaucratic entities, the Department of Energy hardly exists. It has a budget of about \$11 billion for fiscal 1979; it has nearly 20,000 full-time employees—plus about 100,000 people who don't show up in the personnel figures but who work full-time under contract on its research and development programs and special projects. But after 18 months of operation, it does not have a complete table of organization, and the staff has not finished writing Civil Service classifications for its employees. Its internal communications are so poor that Schlesinger's top assistants have sometimes not been told that their boss would appear on national television.

The department's standby gasoline rationing plan, due on Capitol Hill in 1976, was not sent up until March 1, 1979; congressmen were acerbic about the timing—during the middle of the Iran oil scare. The department's largest single project, the mammoth Strategic Petroleum Reserve, or SPRO in department slang, is at least a year behind schedule and far over original budget estimates. During the Iranian oil cutoff the nation discovered that the oil already stored by SPRO could not be used if needed; the department had neglected to install pumps to get it out.

In a series of recent interviews, Schlesinger and other top Energy officials insisted that they have done the best they could under difficult circumstances. "The world at large is alarmed at the little progress we have made in the last 18 months," says Deputy Secretary of Energy John O'Leary. "I am constantly amazed at the progress we've made in the past 18 months."

But others don't agree. A department-sponsored "management audit" by independent consultants released last month found that Energy's top management was poorly organized, its policy planning spotty, and its field structure was not integrated into the headquarters staff. "The public complaint that we haven't seen results is well-taken," said one source who helped prepare the re-



port. "It is not the finest managed department in the world."

And at the department's lower level, there is confusion and a sense of leaderlessness. "DOE is about as well organized today as the Titanic was in its 11th hour," said one employee who asked not to be named, "and internal communications are about the same as in a cloistered monastery."

The Carter-Schlesinger energy policy may be the correct one; or—as dozens of critics insist—it may be neglecting the importance of solar energy, conservation, gasohol, or energy from biomass. But the travails of the Energy Department can teach us a great deal about the Carter administration's passion for reorganization—for drawing clean flow-charts and tidy boxes, and then trying to cram the government into them. The decision to create a Department of Energy was possibly ill-conceived and probably ill-timed; it has produced a department which is certainly ill-designed and unquestionably ill-managed. It has drawn the efforts of hundreds of well-meaning, well-paid, hard-working officials into tasks that have nothing to do with the energy crisis—clearing nominations with Congress, fighting over desk space, moving from one office to another, drawing and re-drawing tables of organization, complying with Civil Service regulations.

Lincoln E. Moses, the gravely humorous former Stanford professor who now heads DOE's Energy Information Administration, tells an anecdote when asked what he has accomplished in his job. He recalls meeting another statistician and saying to him, "When I was head of the Stanford statistics department, I got hot water installed in the faculty washroom. What did you accomplish?" Replied the friend, "When I was head of my department, I got soundproofing installed in the ceiling of the faculty office." Adds Moses, "I tell you this fable because it reminds me of working for the federal government."

Listening to Energy officials explain their efforts to bring order out of chaos, it is impossible not to conclude that, far from hastening a national attack on the energy problem, the creation of the Department of Energy has postponed it by three to five years. Although Carter seemed to promise bold surgery on the energy problem in his campaign speeches, he has in effect hired a somewhat dotty private nurse and told her to make the patient as comfortable as possible.

To begin with, the department does not have a cohesive, rational structure. Each of its prime bureaucratic components has had a distinctly checkered past. The Federal Energy Administration was begun as a temporary regulatory agency in response to the embargo; in five years of life it had two names and four chief officers. The Atomic Energy Commission had been a hardline nuclear cheerleader, so much so that Congress decided in 1975 to take regulation of the reactor industry away from it by creating the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; as the Energy Research and Development Administration, it had begun to add solar energy research and other alternate sources to its research program. The Federal Power Commission was empowered to license new electric utility plants, set interstate electric rates, and regulate natural gas; it had acquired a reputation as a kind of never-never land, where legalistic procedures were able to protract simple questions into matters of almost infinite duration.

The theory behind the Department of Energy bill was that by combining regulation with research into all aspects of energy, the new department would enable the government to make coherent, centralized decisions about energy. The secretary of energy was to have broad, sweeping powers to make rules, set rates, apportion R&D funds and use a mixture of rewards and incentives to steer the nation away from costly or wasteful

fuel technologies into cleaner, more rational paths.

But the concept of the secretary of energy as a true energy czar ran into problems on Capitol Hill. Said Rep. John Dingell (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Energy and Power subcommittee, "The age of the kings expired with the French revolution. I plead with this body, do not set up a new king here in Washington." The House of Representatives heeded, and by the time it had finished whittling the "king" down to size, he had less power than he started out with. Instead of abolishing FPC, Congress cloned the old body inside the new Energy Department, under the name Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)—a five-member body appointed by the president and not responsible to the secretary of energy or anybody else. Not only did FERC retain all of FPC's old powers—and its venerable slow-motion procedures—but it acquired broad authority to overrule the secretary on oil regulations and other matters. Indeed, because of FERC's quasi-judicial character, the secretary must be extremely careful in his communications with FERC and its members, and often must use his lawyers to communicate with the commission. So in the reorganizer's own terms, the final bill represented a big step away from centralized, rationalized energy planning.

Other parts of the department's design also seem questionable from a clean flowchart point of view. For example, \$2.6 billion in fiscal 1979—about one-quarter of Energy's annual budget—goes to making bombs and nuclear fuel for the Pentagon. The defense programs section of the Energy Department is only tangentially related to the department's overall mission of managing our national energy supply. It had been a part of AEC since the agency was set up, however, chiefly because Congress did not want to give the Defense Department control over its bomb program. When AEC became ERDA, and later DOE, the defense programs came along for the ride.

Again, a key part of regulating the nation's energy supply—the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—was deliberately left outside of DOE from the beginning, largely because public confidence in atomic safety was low.

What emerged from the administration's political calculations—and Congress revision of them—was thus less a rational governmental structure than an unwieldy agglomeration of functions under the loose control of a constitutional monarch. ERDA's research functions survived in the research and application programs; most of FEA's petroleum regulatory authority was centralized in an Economic Regulatory Authority (ERA); and FPC survived, with new commissioners, as FERC.

Once given its flawed charter, the new department faced some unavoidable problems of combining three large organizations. Because of its "high-technology" mission, ERDA had been exempt from Civil Service. When it became part of DOE, every ERDA employee had to be given a Civil Service classification. Independent contractors were hired just to write job descriptions, while DOE borrowed or hired "classifiers" from all over the government to translate these descriptions into classifications acceptable to the Civil Service Commission. As a result of this Herculean effort, Energy's director of administration William Heffelfinger says proudly, "Everybody is on a job sheet of some kind." Though classification was to be complete by April 30, it is only 70 percent done. "We saved the harder ones for last," Heffelfinger says forebodingly.

There was also the problem of moving into the Forrestal Building. President Carter gave this modern, slightly building on the Mall to the department as a symbol of the administration's commitment to energy issues; but by April, only 1,508 of a projected 5,000 Energy Department employees had

moved in. "We are slowly but very steadily moving in, like the waves that come with the tide," says Frank Pagnotta, the burly former CIA official who is in charge of the operation. "We established our beachhead April 1 [1978] and we have been occupying new lands as they develop."

The problem is that there aren't very many new lands and nobody wants to move out to create them. Defense Department employees already in the Forrestal didn't want to go, and they got Congress to investigate whether they should; residents of the neighborhood where many of them were to be transferred didn't want a large new federal presence, and they filed suit to stop it.

One casualty of the space warfare is the old ERDA headquarters at 20 Massachusetts Ave. NW, which had been renovated for ERDA just a few years before; because the Corps of Engineers would be displaced by the move into the Forrestal, DOE traded them to the old ERDA headquarters. Currently, DOE is gathering employees there to get them ready for the move to the Forrestal; for some, it will be their third move since "immediate order" was created in the energy field.

In addition to the built-in shocks of moving, getting new (and sometimes lower) job classifications, getting used to new bosses and learning new procedures, DOE's research and development side—the remnants of ERDA—were undergoing another jolt as Schlesinger redesigned its organization to fit the latest management theories. ERDA had been organized by fuel type—with a coal program, a nuclear program, a solar program, and so on. Under DOE, research and development has been shifted to an approach called "stage of application." Under this theory, basic research is shifted down the organizational line into an applications area as it becomes ready for commercial use. Various parts of the old solar office, for example, might find themselves under the assistant secretary for energy technology or the assistant secretary for conservation and solar applications, depending on how close to commercial usefulness they are judged to be. Because DOE is not in business to produce energy itself, but only to show private industry better ways to save and produce it, there is a special deputy undersecretary for commercialization, whose job is to market various techniques and inventions to private industry as they come down the line.

DOE officials insist this change was necessary to make sure administrators did not become lobbyists for their type of fuel—and that new ideas are released for commercial use when they are ready. On the flow chart, it looks good; it may even work the way it's designed to some day. But in the department's early days, it has unquestionably contributed to confusion and bureaucratic struggles. "Six months ago, I spent all my time on turf struggles—'Is it ready or not?'" admits Deputy Secretary O'Leary. But he boldly predicts that "two years from now it will work automatically."

Beyond the natural shocks arising from reorganization, DOE has also had to put up with sloppy management. As Schlesinger sees it, his job is to be Carter's chief spokesman and adviser on energy. "The main business of this department," he said in a recent interview, "continues to be the development of national energy policies and the national consensus behind them—to the extent that is possible."

So Schlesinger has spent his time almost totally outside the department—lobbying on the Hill, speaking to industry groups and advising the President. Between January and April of this year, by DOE's count Schlesinger appeared on Capitol Hill 17 times, made 12 major speeches, held three press conferences and appeared on three televised interview shows. This workload, Schlesinger's defenders point out, is down from the days just after DOE began, when the bitter fighting over the Carter energy bill

kept Schlesinger up on Capitol Hill almost fulltime.

Many Cabinet officers play a similar public role; but they usually turn over the running of their agencies to a strong "executive officer," who can sort out bureaucratic disputes and make sure the fine words announced in public bear some relation to what is being done at the agency. This leadership role is particularly important at a new organization, where attitudes and authority are fluid. But Schlesinger did not designate anyone to fill it.

When the DOE bill was proposed, it included one deputy secretary—theoretically the spot for the "executive officer"—and two undersecretaries; Congress eliminated one of the undersecretaries. Schlesinger's response was simply to treat the deputy and the undersecretary as equals, giving each charge of half the department's operation and leaving the "executive officer" job empty.

As deputy secretary, he named John O'Leary, a veteran energy bureaucrat who had been fired by Nixon as head of the Bureau of Mines but returned with the change of administration as Carter's choice to head FEA. Under Schlesinger's management, O'Leary was given charge of regulatory matters, policy planning and information systems. The undersecretary he named was Dale D. Myers. A former NASA official, Myers was given charge of programs which spent money—energy research and application, defense programs, and the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

"It might have worked with three people who had worked closely before," said a former DOE official. "But these were three busy men—and they were practically strangers."

The result has been a confusing administrative jumble, in which, for example, the official responsible for assigning personnel slots reports to the deputy secretary, while the controller, who must approve salary payments, reports to the undersecretary.

The department's field structure, for another example, now plugs into headquarters almost at random. Asked who was in charge of the field structure, Schlesinger said he would have to check the organizational chart. In fact, no one is. Interviews with O'Leary, Myers and John M. Deutch, director of energy research, revealed a structure in which the DOE's regulators report to O'Leary, while the labs report simultaneously to various assistant secretaries, Deutch and Myers. It is worth remembering that these labs do much of DOE's most important—and costly—work. During the Three Mile Island nuclear crisis, for example, a DOE lab in Idaho Falls helped supply information that allowed technicians to disperse a dangerous hydrogen bubble in the reactor vessel without an explosion or catastrophic meltdown.

One casualty of Schlesinger's casual approach to internal organization has been morale inside the department. The secretary is respected by those around him for his abstract intelligence and verbal agility; but subordinates say he has made little effort to befriend those beneath him, and he projects a chilly, authoritarian style which they find intimidating. In addition, he has staffed the higher echelons of DOE with large numbers of former military officers, Defense Department officials, or old CIA hands; Pentagon whistle-blower Ernest Fitzgerald once remarked that DOE had become "the great Pentagon in the sky." The result has been a management structure which is strong on hierarchy and short on group feeling. One lower-level employee told the story of a man who claimed to have invented a miraculous machine that would solve the energy problem. The inventor had sent the plans to his congressman, who had forwarded it to the Energy Department. Rather than turn it over to a low-level employee, an assistant secretary answered it himself, for fear of offending

the congressman. "Schlesinger has everybody so terrified that nobody wants to be caught off base," the employee explained. "So they're all form and no substance. And the sad thing is, it takes time to answer a letter like that."

But there are other, more substantive, casualties of Energy's chaotic first 18 months. None is more revealing than the paralysis of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which accounts for more than a quarter of the department's 1979 budget. By any objective measure, SPRO is a vital part of DOE's mission.

The objective is to store 750 million barrels of oil in underground salt caverns in Louisiana and Texas, to be drawn out and used in an emergency. In time of oil embargo, or war, the oil in the domes—roughly equal to one month's domestic production—might conceivably make the difference between paralysis and survival. Storing it is an immensely complicated technical task, and represents a huge financial expenditure. A year ago the department projected the cost at \$14.4 billion; that figure is certain to increase.

But SPRO, which was at one time scheduled to have more than 250 million barrels of oil stored by now, has only 82 million. Schlesinger admits that the program is "about a year" behind schedule, for which he blames the restraints put on him by local authorities and the Environmental Protection Agency. "Rarely in the past has a major national effort of this kind been undertaken without a decision to go to wartime methods," he said. "In World War II you might have run roughshod over (environmental constraints) and that might have been the preferable way in this instance."

But many of SPRO's problems actually arose because it was neglected while the tasks of reorganization drew Schlesinger's attention elsewhere. The departmental flowchart originally placed SPRO two layers beneath the assistant secretary for resource applications. So the huge program remained under acting leadership for 10 months, until an assistant secretary was recruited and confirmed and then was able to recruit his own director.

In the meantime, problems built up in SPRO until a report by the office of the department's inspector general two months ago concluded that millions of dollars had been wasted because of poor inventory control, bad procurement and contract administration, misuse of equipment and poor planning. SPRO's management had not even bothered to get exemptions from local sales taxes—routine for federal projects—and, as a result, had paid \$150,000 in sales tax for a single contract.

After an audit by the inspector general, SPRO applied for an exemption and a refund; but in other areas, the report said, "We are not satisfied that corrective action is taking place as rapidly as it should. . . ."

In addition, of course, SPRO's management made the now-famous decision not to install pumps to bring the oil out until 1980 or so. During the Iranian oil crisis, this decision received massive criticism; interim pumps are scheduled to be in place this month.

Last September a fire broke out at one SPRO salt dome in which one worker died and another was injured; 30,000 barrels of crude oil were lost. As a result of this debacle, the SPRO program was belatedly moved up to report directly to Myers. But by the time the program began to get its construction and safety programs under control, the collapse of the Shah's government sent oil prices soaring, and the Energy Department decided to stop buying oil for storage for fear of sending spot prices even higher.

"We're now in the position where we have lots of capacity but no oil in the ground," Myers admits. Still, he says, SPRO was in-

tended as a cushion against price instability; by not buying oil, it is reducing world demand. Thus, he argues gamely, "in one sense, we're kind of doing what SPRO's secondary mission was."

The SPRO disaster is enormous but not unique. Everywhere in the Energy Department are deadlines missed, slots unfilled, organizational charts incomplete, lines leading nowhere. For example, FERC's new management has tried to simplify its procedures and shorten its waiting periods; but the press of new applications—and the new 27-tier natural gas pricing system—has resulted in a larger backlog of cases than it inherited from FPC, while the difficult issues of procedural reform have not yet been tackled. On another level, many of DOE's civil-service employees say they feel they are trapped in an organization that does not work, and that nobody cares.

One man reported that in his division the confusion over financial procedure had resulted in unpaid travel vouchers of as high as \$300 for a period of five months. Another pointed to the offices around his and said, "Ever since I've been here, I've never heard any admonition about conservation. The heat in the building is too hot. During the winter, people left their radiators on all night. Or in the summer they left their fans on. It would never occur to Schlesinger that we ought to be first in conservation." "We found too many anecdotes of lost or delayed correspondence, delay in coordination, lack of early warning and poor dissemination of policies and decisions," said the management audit.

Schlesinger loyalists insist that confusion is inevitable in assembling a large, complex new agency and that it is unfair to judge the department a failure or a success after only 18 months. They further say that during much of the agency's life its top leadership has been embroiled in the bitter house-to-house legislative fighting that surrounded Carter's first energy plan, which took nearly two years to be enacted.

"It takes you at least three or four years to make a department operational," says Schlesinger soothingly. Adds Myers, "I think any new agency has some growing pains. I went through the merger of two major corporations and it took some time to get our act together." Says George McIsaac, assistant secretary for resource applications, "In some respects, even though we all knew what we were getting into, the American people perhaps expect too much. DOE, after 18 months, is expected to perform with the finesse of the Department of Defense. . . . We're doing just fine."

There's something to that argument. The task of organizing the Energy Department is a huge one; many of those who have undertaken it are manifestly competent, energetic and sincere in their devotion to its mission. Despite its reputation, the department is far from a nest of bureaucratic duff-sitters or civil-service clock-watchers. But the DOE was sold to the people as a means of introducing "immediate order" and as a way of coping with a serious, immediate crisis, one Carter later termed "the moral equivalent of war."

Now the soothing bureaucratic noises—the words saying: relax, give us a few years, let us get our act together—unavoidably raise the question of whether this trip was really necessary, whether creating a cabinet department is the proper response to the perception that we are in a "crisis"—about energy or anything else.

As a crisis-solving agency—a Pentagon to conduct the moral equivalent of war—DOE is a clear failure. One does not fight a war by reorganizing the government. Schlesinger, a master of blaming his troubles on outside conditions, once remarked "how grateful we should be that the Japanese chose to attack Pearl Harbor prior to passage of the National Environmental Policy Act." But one could



argue as forcefully that, had the nation responded to Pearl Harbor by reorganizing the Department of War, we would have probably had to fight the enemy on the outskirts of Kansas City.

Viewing the situation in wartime terms, the proper response to an energy crisis would probably have been either to throw huge amounts of money into research to find new supplies of energy and to organize government-run facilities to produce synthetic gas and oil, gasoline or solar power, or to impose rationing and mandatory conservation measures, thus ending our dependence on foreign oil. Either plan would have huge drawbacks—research funding would lead to some waste and boondoggle; rationing would bring inequities and profiteering. But they might get results quickly, and, in wartime, one has not the luxury of constructing a clean flow-chart before giving battle.

By choosing to view the energy problem as one calling for reorganization, the administration, wittingly or not, seems to have decided that the energy problem would be a feature of our national life for quite a while to come—a nagging, intractable, but not threatening obstacle to sound planning and smooth economic growth, one that could wait three or four or five years for a concerted attack.

One side effect of reorganization is that it gives huge masses of people a vital career stake in the problem at hand. For a brief time during its debates on the Energy Department bill, Congress considered writing in a "sunset" provision that would have abolished it after five years. It's a shame the provision was removed. However, there was an amendment to provide a congressional review in 1982. That seems like a good time to take another look at the idea of an Energy Department.

For right now, however, one thing seems clear: the current reorganization has shaken our federal energy machinery almost to the breaking point. The one thing that is not needed right now is another hefty dose of "immediate order." The machine we have—bad as it seems—should be cleaned up, given sound management, and allowed to run for a few years. Schlesinger says he has heeded the message of the critical management audit.

Late last month, he issued the first of a series of orders designed to correct the flaws it criticized. From now on, O'Leary is to be the department's "executive officer," and Myers has been effectively demoted to a role supervising conservation programs and SPRO.

Three years from now, Congress will have a chance to decide if he—or his successor—has succeeded, if the organization needs changing and if we need an Energy Department at all. If they don't do a thorough job, after that DOE will sail serenely into the stream of American bureaucracy, untouchable and unstoppable, whether it's needed or not.

"In five years, the world is going to change," says one department official. "A lot of the things we're doing in energy are going to be done—and we'll still be here. We're a latter-half-of-the-20th-century Agriculture Department." ●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 30, is the traditional day for Memorial Day observance in New York.

Because I participated in Memorial Day ceremonies in my district, I was unable to be on the floor of the House for part of yesterday's session. Had I been present during the consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 7, the Veterans Health Care amendments, I would have voted "aye." ●

#### PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS

**HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the following statement of Larry Bouska included in the RECORD. Larry is currently the national service officer for the Disabled American Veterans in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Recently he gave testimony at a special Veterans Affairs' Subcommittee hearing that I chaired in Sioux Falls in connection with Vietnam Veterans Week. I feel his statement is indicative of the current problems and situation that Vietnam-era veterans are facing across the country and should be included in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

#### STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE BOUSKA

My name is Lawrence Bouska. I grew up in Yankton. My father is a combat veteran of WWII.

After having received a draft notice, I enlisted in the Navy in 1967. I am a combat disabled veteran, having served in Vietnam between June 1968 through October 1970. I currently work as a National Service Officer for the Disabled American Veterans.

I do not really know where to begin my story. However, I suppose enlisting is where to begin.

My generation as a majority grew up with deep and patriotic roots. Our fathers served in a popular war—either WWII or Korea. Many of us lost fathers or uncles. Their talk of war reflected pride in how they responded to the needs of America.

However, those of us of the Vietnam era were constantly exposed to the negative feelings of Vietnam, yet we were torn between that and our inborn pride in serving our country in time of war. We were torn between what we had heard about Vietnam and the inborn need to have our families accept us as veterans.

For me, it would have been a let down to not have served our country exactly as my father. Therefore, after on active duty, I volunteered for duty with the "Seabees"—just as my father had. I knew full well that this would get me to Vietnam.

One has great apprehension going to Vietnam. Negative press and mixed emotions. However, during training the word "kill" takes on meaning. Can I do it? Patriotism is at its highest prior to landing in Da Nang. But what do we encounter initially? As we deplane, the fellows taking our seats tell us how screwed up this place is.

It did not take me long to understand. Within a week I had been awarded the combat action ribbon. Not a pleasant experience. I soon learned what incoming was—for the guy next to me it was a final lesson. Bodies mangled—some were medevacked—I picked others up in plastic bags. I discovered what fear was. Night after night I laid awake—afraid to sleep for fear of dying.

I can remember five of us pinned down in a massive barrage of mortar fire relearning how to pray. I actually prayed that I would die and have this all ended. I feared being wounded and not dying. On occasion, beer became the only way to get sleep and to forget.

Yes, perhaps I saw what some call atrocities. But, in our guerrilla war the front was not defined nor the enemy definable. Does that farmer have a grenade or pistol? Does that mother and her baby have weapons concealed? Does that little girl have explosives in the frame work of her bicycle or Honda? Yes, I saw all these things.

I read the papers and just got more confused. What did those people mean?—We couldn't win. All of us know that we could have won—had we been allowed to. I hope that for any future conflict, politicians do not run the war.

For 30 months I was physically lucky. But with 5 days to go, I ended up being medevacked myself. Even though I couldn't walk, I started thinking that now I had went the complete cycle. Perhaps my guilt was washed away. Now I would be going home as a combat disabled veteran. I thought I would be received by my family and friends. Even with those feelings, I felt it necessary to bring presents home with me for my family as an extra assurance that they would accept me.

But, even on the way home, I couldn't understand why I had been discharged with stitches still in my legs and a draining infection. But, I was out.

Once home, it seemed as if no one even cared to talk about what I'd been through. My little brother was only interested in whether or not I had killed any women or children. I guess that was natural since what he saw on TV was My Lai. My friends could have cared less. I was not welcomed as the veteran I wanted to be.

Within a month of civilian life, it was necessary to contact the VA—after all, I had been told the VA could take care of me. The infection and pain in my leg was so bad—I had to get that cleared up. I would like to state that the excellent care I received was beyond belief.

Even though I had a good construction background, I couldn't get a job. In the hospital, a DAV national service officer counseled me, advising me of benefits and filing the necessary paperwork. I felt that those guys cared. I guess I am lucky because people probably look at me and say that Larry Bouska has adjusted—he's got no problem. I graduated from college then went to work for the DAV. I don't know why I choose the DAV, but maybe I was trying to sort my head out; if I can help another disabled veteran maybe I won't have the time to think of myself as a veteran.

Since I have been in this work, I've come across hundreds of Vietnam veterans who've got problems, employment, schooling, marriages and the law. It seems as though these problems are getting worse now rather than better. However, it now appears that someone has recognized this phenomena and tabbed it the "delayed-stress syndrome". I am sure that you have heard about "delayed-stress". I would refer you to the "forgotten warrior project" which was sponsored by the DAV. The results of this study are alarming in the problems surfacing in veterans around 10 years after having left Vietnam.

The DAV has launched an outreach program for the victim of delayed stress. I would be willing to discuss in detail the nature of our program. However, I would ask the question "why hasn't the Government seen fit to go forth with this program? Who's responsibility is the Vietnam veteran?"

But perhaps the Government can not deal with "delay-stress". After all, most of us have been turned off by the Government. I have seen VA doctors in the past and almost every time I tell, or try to tell, the doctors I can

not sleep at night. Yet, the last doctor I saw said there is nothing he could do. He didn't give me a chance to talk. Yet, how can they with their schedules? I wonder if I am a veteran or a number that can be put on a report.

Earlier I had stated that the care I received by the VA in 1970 was excellent. However, I can not make that statement now. The last time I saw a VA doctor in December I was told that he wouldn't do anything until I saw a neurologist. Well, I saw a neurologist in January. As of today, I have not received an appointment to see the orthopedic physician. Is this the priority that all service-connected veterans get? Is this care second to none or next to nothing?

Recent surveys conducted outside of the VA show that there are long waits to see doctors with scheduled appointments, medications are either labeled wrong or delayed, people are not informed as to travel reimbursements, in cases VA personnel are not perceived by the veteran to be courteous, many veterans are turned away from the VA and are subsequently admitted to private hospitals. Some of us are being turned off to VA medical care.

Even more alarming to me is the use of physicians assistants by the VA. I have in my possession considerable documentation as to the use of PA's who are not under the direct supervision of doctors. I would be willing to discuss this further.

Although I am grateful that our problems are being recognized, I am disappointed with the way in which we are being depicted to the American public. We are not "time or human bombs" ready to explode, ranking with the winos or deranged.

We just want to be accepted as veterans.●

#### EXEMPTING VEHICLES WHICH ARE LEASED TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FROM STATE TAXES AND FEES

**HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1979, I introduced H.R. 4064, a bill to provide that owners of motor vehicles leased by the U.S. Postal Service solely and exclusively for its use shall be exempt from the payment of State and local taxes and fees.

It has come to my attention that some 15 to 20 percent of the price which the Postal Service pays for such vehicles is to cover the cost of licenses, tags, fees, and inspections. There are a number of States which already waive these fees for owners of such leased vehicles. My bill would make this practice uniform across the Nation.

The General Accounting Office has already reported that it is more economical for the Postal Service to lease vehicles than to purchase such vehicles. Leased vehicles are also better energy savers than the Postal Service's right-hand jeep, which gives very few miles to the gallon.

It has also been estimated that exemption of leased vehicles from State and local taxes and fees would result in a savings to the Postal Service of about \$1.6 million annually. This amount, shared among States and localities across the Nation, would result in a negligible shortfall in their revenue income.

At a time of fiscal restraint and the acute energy crisis, my bill will allow the Postal Service greater flexibility in cost savings. It will provide the Nation's leased vehicles an opportunity to provide an important public service.

I want to emphasize that this bill provides an exemption only for those vehicles which are leased to the U.S. Postal Service solely and exclusively for their use. Once the vehicle is removed from service, it would then be subject to all applicable State and local taxes and fees.●

#### SALUTE TO VETERANS

**HON. ARLEN ERDAHL**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the people who have served this country by giving their time, efforts, and all too often, their lives for the sake of duty. We have lost about 1,200,800 military personnel during the course of our history—people who died for us. That sad figure deserves our thought. It is fitting that we stop and remember them.

It is painfully easy to imagine the death of one person. But when that person is multiplied by more than 1 million the mere number deadens one's senses.

Walking through Arlington National Cemetery on Memorial Day weekend brought out a gloomy respect for the dead as I surveyed the neat white rows of gravestones, by which someone unknown had placed fluttering American flags. I respect those men who thought enough of their country to fight, but it was with sadness I watched the silence of their graves.

We lost about 4,000 military in the American Revolution, 2,000 in the War of 1812, 13,000 in the Mexican War, 495,000 in the Civil War, 11,000 in the Spanish-American War, 116,000 in World War I, 406,000 in World War II, 55,000 in the Korean conflict, and 86,000 during the Vietnam era.

I have talked about the losses. Now it is time to recall the many millions more who have served their country and lived, or are still living. They all deserve commendation, and this week, in which Memorial Day fell, we should all take time out to recognize the service put forth by these people. They served that we might be free.

It is also Vietnam Veterans Week, a time for us all to recognize the duty veterans from the Vietnam era have fulfilled.

There is no reason for Vietnam veterans to apologize for their service to this country. But instead of coming home to marching bands and waving flags, these young men returned to their homeland often to find unemployment, a society that ignored them, and even animosity.

The Vietnam war was unpopular. But the image that has been colored of Vietnam veterans in television, movie and

other media dramas over the years is unjustified by the facts.

Most Vietnam veterans are ordinary citizens who served their country. Most of them have made a satisfactory readjustment to civilian life, but a substantial number still have problems—medical, economic, psychological, and educational.

The administration seems to have backed off the commitment our Government has long maintained concerning veterans. They need equal opportunity for jobs. They need opportunity for adequate training and health care.

"Let us . . . care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan . . ." Abe Lincoln wrote during the Civil War. Let's not abandon our veterans, but give them the respect and opportunity they deserve.●

#### POPULATION PLANNING: THE CASE FOR STABILIZATION

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, in its founding, the United States became synonymous with the pursuit of individual liberty—of rights and opportunities for its citizens. The pursuit continues. We have made progress not by avoiding the need for limits in our lives and actions; instead, it has been the achievement of our respect for personal, social, and legal limits. "Liberty is meaningless save in terms of the law," a political scientist once said.

As an environmentalist and a Member of Congress, I have learned the value of wisely chosen limits. I have also seen the consequences of their absence—especially in unlimited and unplanned population growth. I believe the American tradition of guaranteeing liberties and opportunities through personal and public limits is what planning for population changes and voluntary stabilization is all about. By planning, personally to limit our family size and collectively to limit our national population growth, we can aim for a freer society for ourselves and our children, one which is in harmony with nature and fills purposes other than merely quantitative growth.

Planning for voluntary population stabilization—for the time when the number of people in the country does not increase from one generation to the next—is a means to the goal of a freer society, personally, politically, and environmentally. Planning will help to guide us through demographic changes that eventually may give us a balance between immigration and births with emigration and death over time. Planning will also help us to take advantage of the opportunities those changes will create.

The need for limits and planning exists now, to address continued U.S. population growth—close to 2 million people annually—and to deal with other new demographic changes. People are



living longer; they are having smaller families; the proportion of older citizens in society is increasing; more and more people are migrating into the country illegally. In the last 8 years, the population grew more than during any other 8-year period before World War II—more than 13 million people. In the next 8 years, it may add another 12 million to 23 million people, according to Census Bureau projections.

Although many of us, including President Carter, are just beginning to realize how changes in the age structure and migration will dramatically reshape the Nation's future, many more have been talking for years about the problems associated with continued population growth itself. In 1971, a national public opinion survey sponsored by the President's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future found 69 percent of Americans perceived national population growth as a serious problem; 85 percent felt the same about world population growth. Five years later, a Gallup/Kettering Global Survey found that 87 percent of Americans would not like to see the country's population grow; more than 90 percent viewed world population growth as a major problem.

Ending population growth is not a guarantee for a better future, but planning for population changes and stabilization promises opportunities for a better future through resource conservation, personal economic improvement, better political representation, and healthier families. We need better planning both to influence future population changes and to take advantage of them.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES

In a country as big and varied as ours, some regions are more abundant in resources than others; some have much faster growing populations than others. These differences often do not mesh. While the country overall has plenty of water, shortages are developing in dry regions, including the Southwest, where population growth is especially fast. Although the crunch of oil prices tightens with no relief in sight, we are experiencing a nationwide shift in population growth to counties outside of metropolitan areas where people depend more, not less, on automobile driving and oil consumption.

Pollution is a sign of resources wasted: Fuels used inefficiently, environments fouled, human health impaired. Population growth can defeat pollution control efforts.

Take air pollution, for example. The Office of Technology Assessment expects air quality to be little better in another 20 years, despite emission controls. More cars and congested traffic are the reason. If there had been no population growth between 1946 and 1968, poisonous lead emissions from car exhausts would have doubled. But because the population was growing too—and driving—emissions increased fourfold.

The resources we waste are lost not only to future generations of Americans but also to the current generations of other nations. We number only about 5

percent of the world's people, but we account for about a third of the consumption of the world's nonrenewable resources each year. In food alone, one out of every three acres of land in agricultural production already is targeted for export.

#### ECONOMIC WELL-BEING

It is not just the numbers of people but also the resources they consume that count when you assess the impact of population growth. The same can be said for economic growth. It is not just the gross national product but also personal prosperity that matters for most individuals.

Many economists expect slower population growth would bring greater material well-being for the individual. We would be able to invest money to improve education and productivity instead of merely keeping up with more people. With less competition for resources and less depletion of them, natural resource costs would be lower than otherwise. Pollution control would cost less, and there would be less environmental degradation. A larger proportion of the population would be in the work force. There would be more opportunity to reduce inequality of income.

In 1972, the President's Commission on Population Growth said:

We have looked for, and have not found, any convincing economic argument for continued national population growth.

In 1977, a study published by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress made the same point:

U.S. businessmen individually will be better off under low growth . . . There appear to be no economic difficulties inherent in z.p.g.

#### POLITICAL REPRESENTATION

The membership of the U.S. House of Representatives stopped growing back in 1911. The House recognized the need to limit its own growth and the political consequences for its work if it did not. The country, of course, has not stopped growing. Today, each Member of Congress represents more than 450,000 citizens in our district; the Nation's population is almost three times as big as it was when a ceiling was put on House membership. Our districts could grow by another 50,000 to 100,000 each in the next several decades. There are political limits inherent in population growth.

#### FAMILY WELL-BEING

All of us know large families and small families—some well and happy, some not. Numbers do not guarantee their well-being. Personal devotion and resources can make a difference. Smaller families of which we already are beginning to see more and more in this country, go hand in hand with slower population growth. They promise more parent time, more resources to devote to each child, which is no small consideration when you consider the average middle income family can expect to spend an estimated \$64,000 or more to raise a child through age 18.

It is not just a question of money. Whether richer or poorer, children of smaller families have been found to have better chances for good health and development, studies tell us.

Zero population growth means smaller families, on the average, but it does not threaten the survival of the family as the basic institution of life. After a decade of smaller families, most people still marry—95 percent—and most of those expect to have at least one child. The small family—with one or two children—is an increasingly viable choice for people.

Slower growth and other demographic changes are already realities. Planning for these changes and for eventual population stabilization is a commitment to new opportunities and freedoms we still have not made as a Nation. Considering and debating a national population policy to plan for population stabilization will prepare us for that commitment.●

### THE OMNIBUS SOLAR ENERGY COMMERCIALIZATION ACT OF 1979

#### HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced the Omnibus Solar Energy Commercialization Act of 1979 which seeks to promote commercialization of solar energy technologies toward a national goal of 20 quads of energy from renewable resources in the year 2000.

This legislation, which has been introduced in the Senate by John Durkin, is a multifaceted effort that includes establishing a more efficient information dissemination system, a long-interest, long term loan program, and several programs to promote the use of renewable resources by Federal agencies.

The goal of 20 quads of energy is an ambitious but attainable goal (equivalent to one-half million barrels of petroleum per day). The President's Council on Environmental Quality has stated, with aggressive private and governmental support, solar energy can contribute 20 to 30 quads per year of our energy by the year 2000. A quad is a quadrillion Btu's and it is estimated by the CEQ that total U.S. energy demand for the year 2000 will be from 80 to 120 quads.

To achieve this goal, the bill first formally establishes, with the Department of Energy, the Solar Heating and Cooling Information Center. It mandates the Center to develop information services and outreach programs including the development of materials specifically designed to assist architects, builders, manufacturers, and others involved in solar commercialization.

The general public has a lot to learn about solar energy. Public education in the next few years will be crucial in paving the way for solar energy's acceptance as a part of everyday life. By having the Department of Energy coordinate the flow of information through national and regional entities, we can better insure timely, comprehensive material being available.

Second, this legislation provides for a program of low-interest loans easing the

large, initial capital investments solar systems require. These loans would be available at a subsidized interest rate fixed 6 points below the FHA mortgage lending rate for a period not to exceed 30 years. The amount of each loan shall not exceed \$10,000 per unit in the case of any single-family residential structure, \$5,000 per unit in the case of any residential structure with two or more dwelling units (not to exceed \$500,000 per loan), and \$200,000 in the case of any commercial structure.

Private lenders making solar loans are reimbursed the difference between the subsidized interest rate and the market rate in a lump sum payment by a solar energy development corporation, which is to be established within the Department of Energy. The corporation will have the same corporate powers as the Government National Mortgage Association.

The purpose of the solar corporation is: First, to provide reasonable credit terms for the purchase and installation of solar energy systems; second, to provide a source of financial liquidity for private sector financial institutions; and third, to reduce the risk to private sector financial institutions of loans on solar energy systems.

To guarantee the integrity of these loans, each solar energy system purchased and installed with aid of a Federal loan, must be covered by a warranty that at least provides: First, the installer or manufacturer, or both, will remedy any defect in the system or component (including if necessary, repair or replacement at the site) without charge and within a reasonable time, in instances of defects in materials, workmanship, or installation which become evident within 1 year of the date of installation. Second, the installer will provide, without charge and within 15 days before expiration of the warranty, an onsite inspection of the system and components for the purpose of discovering and remedying any defects which may be present.

The third provision of this bill is to require that any new civilian Federal building include, when deemed cost effective, over the building's life-cycle, passive solar energy systems and active solar energy systems. Also it requires the sale of gasoline in all Federal fueling stations which will help that industry expand and decrease the Nation's burden on imported oil.

This act also provides for the Federal power marketing administrations with the authority to purchase and to guarantee the purchase of power from generating facilities utilizing renewable energy resources. These administrations, such as Bonneville Power and Southwestern Power, may even build such a facility if no utility or other person offers to build the facility.

The final section of this legislation authorizes \$50 million in fiscal year 1980 funding to carry out the provisions of this act with a budget outlay of approximately \$100 million per year beginning in fiscal year 1981. These figures are high but I feel they represent a necessary investment for our future energy economy.

Over 100 of my colleagues recently

signed a letter to President Carter urging him to set a high national goal for solar energy implementation. By joining me in support of this legislation, we have the opportunity to translate our rhetoric into action that will truly lead our Nation toward a solar future.

A text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4211

A bill to establish a national goal for the use of renewable energy resources, to establish information and financial initiatives to promote the use of renewable energy resources, and to authorize the use of certain renewable energy resources by the Federal Government

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Omnibus Solar Energy Commercialization Act of 1979".*

#### FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that—

(a) the United States faces an energy shortage arising from decreasing supplies of domestic fossil fuels an insufficient development of renewable energy resources;

(b) unless effective measures are promptly taken by the Federal Government and other users of energy to increase the rate of use of renewable energy resources, the United States will become increasingly dependent on the world oil market, increasingly vulnerable to interruptions of foreign oil supplies, and unable to provide the energy to meet future needs;

(c) the Nation is handicapped by the absence of an established national goal for the achievement of rapid commercialization of solar energy systems;

(d) one of the major impediments to rapid commercialization is the absence of an effective financial institution dedicated to the promotion of solar energy and able to facilitate the widespread commercialization of residential, commercial, and industrial solar energy systems;

(e) the Federal Government can promote the commercialization of the direct solar energy systems by installing solar energy systems in the new Federal buildings;

(f) dwindling petroleum supplies can be directly supplemented through the addition of biomass-derived alcohol to motor gasoline;

(g) the formal establishment of a coordinated network for the dissemination of information to the public is a prerequisite to the development of an improved public understanding of the potential of solar energy systems; and

(h) it is the Nation's interest to provide opportunities for the increased production of electricity from renewable sources.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department of Energy;

(2) the term "renewable energy resource" means any energy resource which has recently originated in the Sun, including direct and indirect solar radiation and intermediate solar energy forms such as wind, ocean thermal gradients, ocean currents and waves, hydropower, products of photosynthetic processes, organic wastes, and others;

(3) the term "solar energy system" has the meaning provided by Public Law 95-619, section 241, which amends the National Housing Act;

(4) the terms "Federal building" and "Federal agency" have the meaning provided by Public Law 94-385, section 303;

(5) the term "entity" means any "person" or "municipality" as those terms are defined in the Federal Power Act;

(6) the term "passive solar energy system"

means space heating and cooling systems that make most efficient use of, or enhance the use of, natural forces—including solar insolation, winds, night time coolness, and opportunity to lose heat by radiation to the night sky—to heat or cool living space by the use of conductive, convective, or radiant energy transfer. Passive solar systems include—

(i) direct gain glazing systems—the term "direct gain glazing systems" means the use of south-facing (plus or minus 45 degrees of true south) panels of insulated glass, fiberglass, or other similar transparent substances that admit the Sun's rays into the living space where the heat is retained. Glazing is either doubled-paned, or single-paned equipped with movable insulation.

(ii) indirect gain systems—the term "indirect gain systems" means the use of panels of insulated glass, fiberglass, or other transparent substances that direct the Sun's rays onto specially constructed thermal walls, ceilings, rockbeds, or containers of water or other fluids where heat is stored and radiated;

(iii) solar/sunspace systems—the term "solar/sunspace systems" means a structure of glass, fiberglass, or similar transparent material which is attached to the south-facing (plus or minus 45 degrees of true south) wall of a structure which allows for air circulation to bring heat into the residence, and which are able to be close off from the residential structure during periods of low solar insolation; and

(iv) thermal pond system—the term "thermal pond systems" means containers, such as tanks or water bags, filled with water or other fluids which when placed on rooftop, capture the Sun's rays and radiates stored heat directly into the residence and makes use of movable insulation to regulate heat absorption and radiation;

(7) the term "Administrator" means an Administrator of a Power Marketing Administration;

(8) the term "just rate" means a rate based on the marginal cost of the production of electricity from a new conventional peaking power electric generator.

#### NATIONAL GOAL

SEC. 4. A national goal is hereby established that, as part of our Nation's total energy supply in the year 2000, a minimum of twenty quadrillion British thermal units of energy shall be supplied from renewable energy resources.

#### INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

SEC. 5. (a) With respect to the information, training, education, and other outreach services referred to in this section, it shall be the policy of the Secretary to utilize to the maximum extent feasible State and local government organizations, the Energy Extension Services, the regional Solar Energy Research Centers, and other such regional entities that are responsible for solar energy activities.

(b) The Secretary shall establish the Solar Heating and Cooling Information Center (hereafter referred to as the Center) for the purpose of providing information services to the public and to the regional entities referred to in section 5(a).

(c) The information services provided by the Center shall include, but not limited to—

(1) retrieval and dissemination of materials relating to the development and commercialization of solar energy system to—

(A) Federal, State, and local government organizations,

(B) universities, colleges, and other non-profit organizations, and

(C) private persons, upon request, in appropriate cases;

(2) development of materials specifically designed to assist—

(A) architects,



(B) builders,  
(C) contractors,  
(D) installers,  
(E) officers of financial institutions,  
(F) building appraisers, and inspectors,  
(G) State and local officials,  
(H) manufacturers, and  
(I) other persons who are involved in the development and commercialization of solar energy systems, and  
(3) development and implementation (where appropriate) of training, education, and other outreach programs specifically designed to assist in the development and commercialization of solar energy systems.  
(d) The Secretary shall coordinate the activities of the Center, the Energy Extension Services, the Solar Energy Research Institute, the regional Solar Energy Research Centers, and other regional entities involved in providing the services referred to in this section.

#### IN-HOUSE FEDERAL ENERGY INITIATIVES

SEC. 6. (a) Effective one hundred and eighty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head(s) of each Federal agency(s) responsible for the construction of any new civilian Federal building shall require that any such Federal building shall include passive solar energy systems, and active solar energy systems unless the head of such Federal agency determines that such active solar energy systems are not cost-effective.

(b) For the purposes of this section, an active solar energy system shall be considered cost-effective if the original investment cost differential can be recovered over the expected life of the Federal building, using a cost criteria based on undiscounted constant dollars, maintenance costs of no more than 1.5 per centum of the active solar energy system cost per year, and regional fuel cost escalation rates as determined by the Department of Energy, under title VIII of the Department of Energy Organization Act of 1977.

(c) Parts (a) and (b) of this subsection shall not apply to those buildings which are designed to operate without heating, cooling, or hot water systems.

(d) For purposes of this section, a Federal building is considered a "new Federal building" if the final design of that building is completed after the date prescribed in subsection (a).

#### FEDERAL FLEET GASOLINE INITIATIVE

SEC. 7. (a) Effective one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each Federal agency operating a fueling station for Federal civilian gasoline motor vehicles located in the United States shall require where available that such fueling station shall dispense only gasoline incorporating 10 per centum alcohol by volume.

(b) Effective one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each Federal agency operating a retail gasoline supply outlet shall require that gasoline incorporating 10 per centum alcohol by volume be made available for retail sale.

(c) Alcohol purchased or produced to comply with the provisions of this section shall be derived from sources primarily other than fossil-fuels.

(d) The head of said agency shall procure quantities of alcohol as required by this section in such a manner as to promote the development of those sources which provide the least potential for environmental degradation.

#### FEDERAL POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION INITIATIVES

SEC. 8. (a) The Administrators of the Alaska Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area

Power Administration are authorized to enter into agreements to purchase and to guarantee the purchase of power from generating facilities utilizing renewable energy resources proposed for construction by non-Federal entities.

(b) The said Administrators are authorized to construct and operate generating facilities, other than hydroelectric facilities: *Provided, however,* That no such facility may be constructed unless the Administrator (1) has made a public offer to purchase or to guarantee the purchase of the power from a comparable facility at a just rate if such facility is constructed by a non-Federal entity, and (2) the Administrator has received no offer from a non-Federal entity to construct such generating facility within one hundred and eighty days after the date of the public offer required by this subsection.

#### FINANCIAL INITIATIVES

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish within the Department of Energy a Solar Energy Development Corporation (hereafter referred to as the "Solar Corporation") with the same corporate powers given the Government National Mortgage Association in section 309(a) of the National Housing Act.

(b) The purpose of the Solar Corporation is—

(1) to provide reasonable credit terms for the purchase and installation of solar energy systems;

(2) to provide a source of financial liquidity for private sector financial institutions; and  
(3) to reduce the risk to private sector financial institutions of loans on solar energy systems.

(c) Within one year of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the Solar Corporation. The Secretary shall appoint a President of the Solar Corporation and other officers and employees as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation. Appointments shall be made pursuant to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

(d) The Solar Corporation is authorized to make payments to financial institutions for the purpose of subsidizing long-term, low-interest loans which are made by such institutions to owners or builders of commercial and residential structures for the purchase and installation of solar energy systems in such structures and which meet the requirements of this section.

(e) (1) The amount of any such payment made with respect to any such loan may be in a lump-sum payment and shall be equal to an amount necessary to compensate the financial institution for making such loan at an interest rate which is 6 percentage points below the current maximum interest rate permitted on a mortgage insured under section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, rather than at the market rate, as determined by the Solar Corporation.

(2) The Solar Corporation may, with respect to any loan with respect to which a subsidy payment is made under this section, require the financial institution to repay the Solar Corporation any amount to which the Solar Corporation is entitled as a result of the borrower's repaying the loan at an earlier date than was scheduled under the original agreement.

(f) A payment may be made under this section with respect to a loan only if—

(1) the term of repayment does not exceed thirty years, except that there shall be no penalty imposed on the borrower if he or she repays such loan or advance of credit at any time before the term of repayment expires;

(2) the amount of such loan does not exceed \$10,000 per unit in the case of any single family residential structure, \$5,000 per

unit in the case of any residential structure with two or more dwelling units (not to exceed \$500,000 per loan), and \$200,000 in the case of any commercial structure;

(3) the solar energy system purchased and installed with such loan is covered by an agreement which contains at least the following warranties—

(A) that the installer or manufacturer, or both, will remedy any defect in the system or component (including if necessary, repair or replacement at the site) without charge and within a reasonable time, in instances of defects in materials, workmanship, or installation which become evident within one year of the date of installation or such longer period as the Secretary determines is reasonable; and

(B) that the installer will provide, without charge and within fifteen days before the expiration of the warranty, an onsite inspection of the system and components for the purpose of discovering and remedying any defects which may be present;

(4) the security for such loan is acceptable to the Secretary; and

(5) the solar energy system financed by such loan is purchased and installed after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) The "Energy Conservation in Existing Buildings Act of 1976" (Public Law 94-385, as amended by Public Law 95-619) is amended by adding a new paragraph after section 412(9) (F) as follows—

"(G) materials associated with passive and active solar energy systems; and", and relabeling section 412(9) (G) as section 412 (9) (H).

(h) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, for administrative expenses associated with the establishment of the Solar Energy Development Corporation.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary not to exceed \$48,000,000 for fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, to fund programs authorized in section 2 through section 8.

DON MITCHELL: PATRIOT OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. MICHEL, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Department of New York, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, recently awarded our friend and colleague, DON MITCHELL, with the Civilian Patriot award.

This award was given not only because of DON MITCHELL's distinguished career as a Councilman, Mayor, State Assemblyman and Congressman, but for his support of a strong national defense policy. As ranking minority member of the Military Compensation Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee and chairman of the Task Force on Military Installations for the Northeast-Midwest Economic Advancement Coalition, DON MITCHELL deserves this prestigious award for his dedication to the continued strength of our Nation.

My congratulations go to Don and also to the Reserve Officers Association for choosing such an excellent recipient.●

## IRRIGATION WATER POLICY

## HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would, if enacted, inject a measure of consistency into Federal agriculture and resource development policies. In brief, this legislation would allow water available for irrigation purposes from federally financed water projects to be used only for those agricultural commodities not designated as surplus crops.

I am proposing this measure today in order to counter what I believe has been the unwise policy of the Federal Government to encourage the production of surplus crops in some areas of the country, while in other areas providing incentives to curb the production of these same crops or making available price supports to their producers.

We are all well aware, Mr. Speaker, that a number of public water projects have been authorized and funded over the years that provided often questionable benefits to the public at significant cost to the taxpayer. Frequently the benefits that were cited as likely to accrue from these projects were in the form of increased agricultural productivity. This increased productivity, in turn, consisted many times of an increase in production of an agricultural commodity which was in surplus and whose production the government was trying to curb through its costly agricultural programs.

One project which serves as a prime example of the glaring inconsistency between our agriculture and natural resource policies is the O'Neill unit irrigation project in north central Nebraska. This project involves the construction of a dam on the Niobrara River and a 28-mile diversion canal to deliver water to 77,000 acres of land. The dam would inundate a significant stretch of the magnificent Niobrara River valley, which provides a unique blend of habitats for eastern, western, northern, and southern wildlife species. Because of the river's outstanding scenery, wildlife and recreation potential conservationists have asked that it be made a part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Construction of the O'Neill unit will require the taking of 30,000 acres to irrigate 77,000 acres. Only 12 percent of the possible irrigated acreage is class I farmland—land with minimum hazards to irrigation. Nearly one-third is class III land which contains soil that has no power to hold water, meaning that irrigation water may pass right through the soil, carrying contaminants to the groundwater below. The estimated cost of the project is \$200 million, which would result in a taxpayer outlay averaging more than \$1,600,000 for each farm benefiting from the project.

Mr. Speaker my proposal would, quite simply, prohibit the use of water from any Federal reclamation project, 10 percent of which is not completed by Sep-

tember 30, 1979, for the irrigation of surplus crops within 10 years of the completion date of such project. Many of the projects which would be affected by this stipulation had included in the language of the acts which authorized their construction a similar prohibition that extended 10 years from the date of enactment of the various acts, rather than 10 years from the completion date of the projects. However, because projects often take more than 10 years from their date of authorization to complete, I believe that it is important to alter this authorizing language in order to preserve the intent of the Congress not to have water from federally financed projects used to irrigate surplus crops.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues' support of this legislation, and I am hopeful that the bill will win prompt consideration.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to prohibit the use of water from certain Federal reclamation projects for the irrigation of surplus crops within ten years of the completion date of such projects

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no water from any Federal reclamation project, the construction of which is less than ten percent completed as of September 30, 1979, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be delivered within ten years from the date of completion of such project to any water user for the irrigation of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in section 408(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1428(c)), or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply, as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1301(b)(10)), as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.●

## A SIGHT TO BEHOLD—FOR 50 YEARS

## HON. WAYNE GRISHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. GRISHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a confession to make.

I represent the 33d Congressional District in California and my home is in a beautiful suburban community called La Mirada which I love.

I have another love—and a second home.

It is Santa Catalina Island—a tranquil place of beauty only 22 miles off the coast of busy Southern California. As you approach Avalon, the only city on the island, whether it be by boat or by plane the first thing you always see is a huge mediterranean style building called the Casino. It is a beautiful sight whether you see it only once or whether you see it scores of times as I have.

The Catalina Casino had a birthday on May 28—its 50th. The late William

Wrigley, Jr., supervised the completion of the Casino in 1929. The magnificent red-tiled structure houses what was once billed as the world's largest dance floor. Thousands have enjoyed dancing to the strains of the big bands through the years. On another level is an acoustically perfect theatre which seats 1,200 people and houses a pipe organ which cost \$40,000 in 1927. Still another level contains an art gallery for local artists and a museum of Catalina Island History.

I would like my colleagues to join me in a salute to an architectural marvel which has given pleasure to so many from within and from without for these 50 years. Congratulations and best wishes to the beautiful city of Avalon and its gorgeous Casino.●

## SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

## HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to help honor those senior citizens in our Nation who have contributed so much to making our Nation as great as it now is. As I am sure you are aware, May has been designated as Senior Citizens Month, and so it is particularly appropriate at this time to speak on behalf of our older Americans.

Who can doubt that we owe most of what we now have to citizens of the generations prior to ours. The senior citizens of today were the soldiers, scientists, humanitarians, and most importantly, the parents and families of yesterday. These people raised us, fed us, and gave us the loving care necessary for our present well-being.

Now it is time that we turn our attention to repaying these invaluable members of our society for the many years they have spent making our world a good one. From this month on, we should make the proper care and attention of today's senior citizens one of our highest goals. We should provide adequate income for food, shelter, and health care. We should provide jobs for those senior citizens who wish to work. We should provide opportunities for senior citizens to be involved in volunteer programs so that they may continue to contribute to the society they built. And perhaps most importantly, we should insure that those senior citizens who can no longer care for themselves, are cared for in clean, healthy, honest, and loving institutions.

There are many problems now facing the elderly of our Nation. Inflation is making the present social security system ineffective. If things are not corrected, the social security system will run out of money in the not so distant future. We must be sure that this does not occur.

The medicare system is infested with corruption and inefficiency. We could provide much better care for many more



elderly citizens than at the present time, if only we could drastically reduce medicare abuses. Nursing homes are much too expensive for the average senior citizen. The average cost of nursing home care in the United States is \$490 per month. The average social security benefit for a retired person is \$257 per month. With this discrepancy, one would expect that Medicaid would pick up most of the bill for nursing home care. Yet only 51 percent of nursing home patients receive assistance from Medicaid, the Federal-State health care program, or programs for medically indigent persons. There are also alternatives to institutionalized care. Adult day care, foster care where senior citizens are cared for by a volunteer family, and home health care are viable alternatives to institutionalization of many elderly citizens. These areas must be more extensively explored.

Perhaps if everyone will look forward to the day when he or she may be unable to care for himself, people will realize the importance of caring for the senior citizens who have contributed so much to our country. The solutions are not easy ones, yet if Congress and others in Government set their minds to it, there is no question that our senior citizens would begin to receive the treatment they deserve. We can provide food for our elderly. We can provide affordable, yet liveable housing for senior citizens. America is a nation which is based on concepts of freedom, and this includes the freedom to live a comfortable life, throughout one's entire life. The proper care of our senior citizens should be a top priority in the minds of those with a social conscience. After all, who deserves our support more than those who raised us from the crib to the honored positions we now hold.

Thank you very much.●

**FLINT FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM TO OBSERVE 10TH ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. DALE E. KILDEE**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride that I point out the upcoming 10th anniversary of a highly successful and innovative education program in Flint, Mich., known as the Flint Follow Through program. It is one of the first of the Follow Through programs established, and one of only 21 that have received national accreditation through the U.S. Office of Education. It is the only accredited Follow Through program in Michigan.

Established in 1969, the Flint Follow Through program serves Dort and Manley community schools in Flint. Under the program, children who are identified through Head Start or a preschool program as being potential low achievers in school, or are from low-income families, are given special assistance from kin-

dergarten through the third grade to insure that they receive the help they need to attain the national norm in the crucial early years of their education. A significant change in instruction was the introduction and implementation of the direct instruction method of teaching reading, language, and arithmetic, which was field tested in the Flint Follow Through program.

Results of the program after 10 years have been improved dental and health care of the students, increased parent education, improved self-concepts for the children, a highly successful parent-volunteer program, involvement of community residents in the program, a more highly skilled instructional staff, and, most importantly, the selected students being able to attain the national norm by the end of third grade as measured by standardized achievement tests.

The original parents and educators, who conceived the program in conjunction with national Follow Through, and all succeeding parents and educators who have sustained the project, deserve special plaudits.

The significant success of the Flint project led to national validation in 1977, followed by Federal funding to establish a resource center. The center is entering its second year of operation, and its purpose is to share the instructional model developed in the Flint Follow Through program with school districts throughout the United States, and to assist in staff training. Flint's resource center so far has helped to develop Follow Through programs elsewhere in Michigan as well as in Kentucky, West Virginia, and Alaska, thus helping to bring the success of the concept to many other school districts.●

**VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK**

**HON. BILL FRENZEL**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1979

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, our involvement in Vietnam ended 5 years ago and America's wounds from that experience are still healing slowly. Because the Vietnam war was so divisive and confusing, many Americans found that the best way to cope with it was to forget it as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, for those who fought the war, forgetting was not always so easy.

As in other wars, our youth carried the burden of the country's call to duty. However, unlike previous wars, there was no victorious homecoming for these veterans. Feelings of contempt, resentment, and bitterness over the war were sometimes transferred to those who fought it, making them the scapegoats for misdirected guilt and frustration with the war itself.

Despite this, the majority of Vietnam veterans managed to pick up the pieces and move forward. However, a significant number were not so lucky. Even today some veterans are struggling to

readjust and overcome emotional and physical scars and economic difficulties.

Although many VA services are available to Vietnam veterans, a national attitude of indifference and an economy racked with inflation have prevented us from doing as much for them as we might have. Indeed, just last week—15 years after our initial involvement in Vietnam—Congress finally approved legislation providing psychological readjustment counseling and drug and alcohol programs for Vietnam veterans. While significant, probably more important and helpful than such legislation would be a change in public attitudes toward these veterans.

It seems that the time is now right for us as a nation to separate our personal feelings about the war from those who fought it. Acknowledging the service and sacrifice of those who fought is a necessary first step toward a national reconciliation. Instead of viewing these veterans as painful reminders of the Vietnam era, we should recognize our debt to these individuals.

I think the Presidentially proclaimed Vietnam Veterans Week can help serve this purpose well. Expressions of appreciation, acceptance, and recognition of this group of veterans can result in giving them a much needed sense of pride, and also serve as their long overdue homecoming. It is my hope that this week will mark the true beginning of emotional and material support for our Vietnam veterans.●

**THE MURDER OF "MAXIMUM JOHN"**

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week our Nation was shocked to learn that U.S. District Court Judge John H. Wood, Jr., was struck down by an assassin's bullet as he stood at the door of his automobile in front of his house in San Antonio, Tex.

Judge Wood, who presided over numerous narcotics trafficking cases, and was alleged to have one of the heaviest narcotics caseloads in the Nation, was known for the stiff sentences he imposed upon convicted narcotics traffickers—earning him the title of "Maximum John." The murder of Judge Wood is deplorable and tragic. A dedicated jurist has been taken from us. The numerous threats that had been made on his life did not deter him from fulfilling the duties of judicial office. He diligently sought to place convicted drug peddlers where they belong . . . in jail.

Although the murder of District Court Judge Wood is apparently the first-known slaying of a Federal judge, several assistant U.S. attorneys, who have been involved in the prosecution of narcotics traffickers, have been injured while performing their duties. Last November, Assistant U.S. Attorney James Kerr, who prosecuted many narcotic

trafficking cases before Judge Wood, was injured when two gunmen fired 15 rounds into his automobile one morning on his way to work.

Last December, Assistant U.S. Attorney Barry L. Leibowitz, who was leading an investigation into a Washington-based international heroin smuggling ring, was seriously wounded by gunmen who shot him while he was entering the Federal court house here in the Nation's capital.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control that has investigated narcotics trafficking in New York, Chicago, Miami, in Latin America, Western Europe and Southeast Asia, along our 2,000 mile-long border with Mexico, and in other areas both here and abroad, I can attest to the deadly dangerous tasks that our law enforcement officials continuously face. The gangland-style attacks on those dedicated officials vividly indicate the risks that the international criminal syndicates are willing to take to sustain their sordid narcotics trafficking \* \* \* a business that yields an estimated \$45 billion just in the United States alone.

If the murder of Judge Wood and the attacks upon Federal prosecutors Kerr and Leibowitz mean anything, then it clearly underscores the urgency for our Nation and for nations of the international community to intensify their efforts to interdict narcotics trafficking, to enact stiff mandatory prison sentences for convicted narcotics violators (such as my proposed H.R. 3674), and for the public to realize the dangers of drug abuse and that the consumption of marijuana, cocaine, heroin and other dangerous drugs only feed billions of dollars into the coffers of organized crime, thereby perpetuating their criminal activity.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Attorney General Griffin Bell and FBI Director William Webster for quickly dispatching additional agents to the San Antonio area to help investigate the murder of Judge Wood and to help bring the perpetrators of this dastardly crime to trial.

Mr. Speaker, although I did not know Judge Wood personally, I wish to express my deep sorrow and condolences to his family. May his dedication to the pursuit of justice inspire us all to act to stamp out this scourge on our society so that his death will not have been in vain.●

#### NEW MATH REVIEW

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share the "New Math Review," which appeared in the May 23 issue of the Rocky Mountain Journal, with my colleagues. Besides being worth a chuckle or two, the review provides a little food for thought.

The "New Math Review" follows:

1. Energy math:  
(Q). If you could buy 100 gallons of gas for 50c per gallon, but only 50 gallons at 75c per gallon, how many gallons could you buy for \$1.00 per gallon?

- (a) 25 gallons.
- (b) 5 gallons.
- (c) Unlimited.

2. Congressional math:

(Q). A Congressperson discloses the following assets:

Salary	-----\$	66,000
Honorariums	-----	100,000
Real Estate	-----	1,000,000
Stocks/Bonds	-----	1,000,000
Trusts	-----	1,000,000
Liabilities	-----	100,000

What is his or her reported worth?

- (a) \$3,266,000.
- (b) \$3,066,000.
- (c) \$50,000-\$3,000,000 (more or less).

3. Calculator math:

(Q). In the event your pocket calculator breaks down on a Sunday, could you add the following problem in your head?

$$2 + 2 = \text{-----}$$

(a) 2.

(b) 4.

(c) Wait until store opens Monday and buy new one.

#### ANSWERS

If you answer "C" to all the questions, you have totally adapted to our times.

If you missed one or more, maybe there is hope for us yet.●

#### TRIBUTE TO ROBERT S. BOOTHROYD

#### HON. GARY A. LEE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion today to call to my colleagues' attention the activities planned by alumni of Ithaca College for the evening of June 7. On that evening, they will join with local business, college, and industrial officers from throughout central New York in honoring Mr. Robert S. Boothroyd for his long years of service.

My interest in bringing this to the attention of this House is to note that Mr. Boothroyd's service to his home community exemplified many of our Nation's most cherished ideals. In 1932, during some of this country's hardest times, Bob Boothroyd started with nothing to build one of central New York's most respected insurance businesses, today ranging in service to its neighbors from very personal, individual protection, to municipal, school, and industrial plans. In doing so, Bob has pursued each new day as if it was the one on which his entire reputation would depend.

His service through community organizations such as the Kiwanis, Rotary, and United Way have contributed significantly to the betterment of his friends and neighbors and to the Ithaca region. And his long, diligent years of fundraising on behalf of Ithaca College where he serves on the board of trustees has been nothing short of remarkable.

These efforts have helped make it possible for Ithaca College to take its place among this country's best equipped,

best staffed, and most highly regarded colleges of its size.

Today, Mr. Boothroyd at 78 years of age continues to occupy his office, sometimes 7 days a week, with the excitement and vigor found only in men half his age. He is truly representative of this Nation's finest professionals. This tribute to Bob is most befitting and welcomed by those of us who know him and admire his work.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for providing me this opportunity to share Bob Boothroyd's contributions with this House.●

#### HELPING CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

#### HON. ANDREW MAGUIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee on Health and the Environment heard testimony recently during a child health oversight hearing from Mary MacCracken, an author with special expertise in mental health and learning disabilities. She pointed out the necessity of preventive and early intervention for "at risk" children with developmental disabilities and/or emotional problems and learning disabilities and stressed the need to integrate health and educational programs. She strongly supported the statement by the President's Commission on Mental Health stating that payment for services should be based upon the need for care, not exclusively on medical diagnosis. She stated that—

Legislation such as the Child Health Assurance Program (CHAP) could provide a first step to ensure that developmentally disabled and mentally ill children do not suffer from discriminatory provisions or fragmented services.

Mr. Speaker, Mary MacCracken's insights deserve the careful consideration of all members. I include her exceptionally informed and moving statement to the subcommittee in the RECORD.

#### TESTIMONY FOR THE CHILD HEALTH OVERSIGHT HEARING

(Presented by Mary MacCracken on behalf of:)

American Association of Children's Residential Centers.

American Association of Psychiatric Services for Children.

American Psychological Association.

American Society for Adolescent Psychiatry.

Epilepsy Foundation of America.

Mental Health Association.

National Association for Retarded Citizens.

National Association of State Mental Retardation Program Directors, Inc.

National Council of Community Mental Health Centers.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

National Easter Seal Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

National Society for Autistic Children.

Mental Health Association, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209, (703) 528-6405.

Epilepsy Foundation of America, 1828 L



Street, NW, Suite 406, Washington, D.C. 20007, (202) 293-2930.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for inviting me. My name is Mary MacCracken from Englewood, New Jersey. My involvement with children is in mental health and as a teacher and educational therapist, learning disabilities specialist, family consultant, writer—lots of titles, but titles mean little. What matters are the children, and the children I work with are children with various learning or emotional problems. I am honored today to represent the many agencies listed on the cover sheet. They all have contributed to the written report which I would like to be included as part of the record.

We are pleased that the Subcommittee is conducting this critical oversight hearing on the health needs of this nation's children. In this International Year of the Child, it is particularly fitting that we reassess the adequacy of our Federal health care programs to meet the needs of our children and, in particular, our children with special developmental or emotional problems, for without appropriate preventive services and, if needed, early intervention, we neglect, and thus abuse, our nation's children.

Today, there are over 100 Federal programs directed toward the needs of children—over twenty directed toward child and maternal health in particular. Yet, in spite of, or perhaps because of this panoply of programs, many children continue to suffer from preventable, treatable health problems. They have "fallen through the cracks" of the very programs designed to help them.

Part of the problem is that the health needs of children differ from those of adults. Yet programs serving them are not directed specifically toward their needs. Rather, children are now being provided services only as extensions of general programs. As an example, we need only look at the Administration's draft of the Community Mental Health Systems Act. The "Most in Need" program for seriously emotionally disturbed children, one initiative within this Act which had the potential of focusing directly on this special population, has been, under that proposal, absorbed in Title I (Chronically Mentally Ill) by the simple addition of the words "and children." A valuable program thus has become just a barely visible appendage.

Even programs that are specifically designed to meet a handicapped child's needs in a comprehensive manner often fail to address the child's physical and emotional health problems. Perhaps the best illustration of this problem is encapsulated in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, P.L. 94-142. The drafters of that legislation acknowledged the need for an integrated educational program which included health services, but at the same time recognized that such services were not the responsibility of the education system. Unfortunately, regulations did not say where the responsibility for providing such health services would lie; as a result, various state agencies now play "pass the buck" and children go unserved. For example, children with spina bifida can, in most cases, be educated in a regular classroom. However, they have been excluded in some states because they need to be catheterized two or three times a day. Schools regard this as a "medical service" and thus do not provide it. Similarly, children with mental illness, either placed in special classes, or integrated within the regular class structure, receive no special mental health care; and this care is vitally needed if the intent of the law is to be realized.

The problem is serious, but is particularly exacerbated for children with special needs. I am referring to children who suffer from a developmental disability or an emotional disorder, and I appear today on their behalf

as well as on behalf of the organizations representing them and those who meet their medical and other health treatment needs. I am speaking of approximately 600,000 children who have severe developmental disabilities and 9.6 million of our nation's more than 64 million children under 18 who suffer from some form of mental illness. The latter figure is based on the findings of the President's Commission on Mental Health.

First, I would like to turn to the developmentally disabled child. By definition, developmental disabilities, which include autism, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and mental retardation, occur early in life; hence, the child does not have a normal maturational experience. Such disabilities are severe in nature, interfering with normal life in several major areas. And, they are not "curable," although early intervention can, in many cases, reduce their debilitating effects.

Let me give you some examples. A child with cerebral palsy may have difficulty walking, using his or her hands, and speaking clearly. So may a child who has been severely injured in an automobile accident. However, the second child may recover with no permanent effects of his or her injuries and so would not be considered developmentally disabled, while the child with cerebral palsy will remain disabled all his or her life. A great many children wear glasses; their impairment is hardly more than an inconvenience. Yet, the same level of visual impairment, if accompanied by a hearing loss and even a moderate or mild degree of retardation, could render a child developmentally disabled because the combination would result in a substantial interference with normal development. It is important to remember that while these developmentally disabled youngsters have the same health needs as normal children, they may not be receiving treatment because practitioners are unavailable to deliver services to them. The reasons for this unavailability of health care is two fold. First, it is often difficult to treat a developmentally disabled child. Imagine, for example, trying to fill, or even clean the teeth of a hyperactive autistic child or of a child whose cerebral palsy makes it impossible for him to control his head movements. Second, and perhaps worse, under Medicaid, the key program under which the low income developmentally disabled or mentally ill child might be treated, the reimbursement rate for treatment in general is so low that there is no incentive to treat the Medicaid child in the first place, and certainly no incentive to treat the emotionally disturbed or developmentally disabled Medicaid child. Moreover, medical services essential for developmentally disabled children, such as prescription drugs for a child with epilepsy or physical therapy for a child with cerebral palsy, may not be eligible for reimbursement under states Medicaid program. In addition, the medical services under Medicaid vary considerably from state to state. For example, a child receiving speech therapy in one state may find that this service is not available to him or her under another state's Medicaid program. This disparity in service availability clearly demonstrates the need for a uniform package of Federally mandated services responsive to the needs of the developmentally disabled children.

Even if help is available, the developmentally disabled child may still be denied benefits because he or she is perceived as harder or more expensive to treat. For example, a youngster who is both mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed may be excluded from programs because such programs are narrowly designed to treat either one, but not both, of his problems. Categorical programs have consistently posed roadblocks to multiply handicapped children.

I would like to turn for a moment to the

special problems of the emotionally disturbed—the mentally ill—child. As I have noted, as many as 9.6 million children may suffer from mental illness. As is the case for the developmentally disabled, our Federal system of health care to meet the needs of these children has been far from exemplary.

The term "mental illness" has different meanings at different times of life. The mental health needs of children differ from those of adults. The diagnostic methods, the training of clinicians, the treatment techniques, the nature of institutional arrangements, and the degree of and quality of family involvement necessary for work with children all vary in considerable degree from those treatment patterns appropriate for adults.

The range of mental health disability may be categorized as follows:

Vulnerable children or children "at risk" do not have obvious psychologic-dysfunction. They have other disabilities often of a chronic character, or they are in family or social settings that require intervention to prevent the development of psychiatric disorder. These children comprise a very large population group and often require intensive and ongoing social interventions to preserve healthy growth and development and to diminish the need for direct psychiatric services later. Some examples of such "at risk" children are the many youngsters with chronic physical disabilities such as blindness, deafness, congenital abnormalities, and the like; children reared in conditions of severe deprivation; children caught up in major natural disasters; children involved in serious parental problems such as alcoholism or bitter custody battles, or loss of a parent through death, desertion or chronic illness and so forth.

Children with minor and transient evidence of difficulty involving social and emotional elements. These youngsters can usually be managed without psychiatric/psychological diagnosis or treatment. They require help from agencies or other social institutions such as schools, counselors, ministers, Big Brothers, visiting nurses, and the like. Mental health consultation to these agencies and institutions is a valuable source of mental health expertise.

Children with evident symptoms of mental or emotional disorder require psychiatric/psychological diagnosis and treatment. The large majority of such children will be adequately served by outpatient treatment. Some will need diagnostic study and evaluation and follow-up interviews. Some may require further regular treatment for 3-6 months. Others may require intensive outpatient treatment from 3 to 4 times a week for a period of several years. Special educational study and neurological examination may also be necessary. The modalities of the required outpatient treatments will vary depending on the individual patient; they may include group, individual and/or family psychotherapy, drug treatment, therapeutic schooling, and others.

A smaller group of children with established psychiatric/psychological diagnoses of mental or emotional disorder will require additional mental health intervention in the form of day hospitalization or day care, therapeutic group homes, therapeutic day nurseries or day schools, specialized half-way houses, or professional foster care placement.

The most disturbed group of children with obvious severe emotional/behavioral disorders of long-standing duration will require highly structured, long-term intensive treatment in the most appropriate inpatient environment. Depending on the individual patient, either a hospital or residential treatment setting will be necessary for adequate care and treatment.

A small number of adolescent patients may require brief hospitalization, residential placement, or day care to help them in dealing with an episode of transient severe

mental difficulty, such as attempted suicide, the rate of which among adolescents has nearly tripled in the past 10 years. Following discharge, a further period of outpatient treatment will be required.

Whatever the degree of severity, whatever the modes of treatment, what we are painfully aware of is the fact that without intervention, these children will not be able to grow up to become productive members of society. They may become one of those thousands of individuals who populate the back wards or back alleys, or perhaps, the criminal justice system. As many as 47 percent of incarcerated juvenile offenders have either a learning disability or a serious neurological disorder. We cannot begin to estimate the numbers of such children who might have been diverted from the criminal justice system if they had been able to receive early diagnosis and timely care.

NIMH has estimated that only 10 percent of our nation's children who need mental health care actually receive such care. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights noted in its Age Discrimination Study that children are receiving mental health services at 1/3 the rate of the 24-44 age group.

I am describing a rather bleak situation. However, we do have the resources to intervene, and in some cases, to prevent the disruption of human life. And let me stress that as in the case of developmentally disabled children, prevention or early diagnosis is a far less costly treatment modality than later remediation through custodial care which we often impose upon those whom we have ignored until it is too late.

The President's Commission on Mental Health Task Panel on Child Health Services noted that the most important principle of child advocacy is that one cannot separate mental health from physical health. The interdependence of physical health, general development and mental health in early childhood creates a particular need for close collaboration among health, mental health, and social systems. And yet, the chasm between these systems is wide and deep.

We have several programs in existence to identify and treat health problems in children. It is regrettable that they are so riddled with restrictions that more children fall through the cracks than are helped. Crippled Children's Services are an example. Evaluation is mandatory for any child referred, but treatment is not. States decide which conditions they will treat and what services they will provide. The chasm noted above widens with each new program which sets such broad parameters, for, unmentioned, the developmentally disabled or mentally ill child is unintended, forgotten.

The Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program is another case in point. Non-Medicaid poor children are not eligible; of the 13 million eligible children, only a fraction are actively participating; of that fraction, a significant number receive only screening services. Again, states vary in what services they will provide—frequently, those discussed earlier and, particularly, mental health services are not covered or inadequately covered.

It has often been thought that the Community Mental Health Center system would be able to provide to the mentally ill child the specialized care needed. However, this has not been the case. Although an accurate accounting of the number of children currently being seen in CMHC's is not available, in 1975, only 300,000 children were reported as being seen in the CMHC system. The lack of appropriately trained mental health professionals and problems attracting such specialists to work in public programs have hampered the Centers' efforts to serve children. Lack of funding at both Federal and state levels and insufficient facilities have

also contributed to the problem. The Task Panel Report on "Mental Health and American Families," which accompanied the Report of the President's Commission on Mental Health, states that children and adolescents with serious mental health problems are being inadequately serviced in CMHC's. Indeed, Part F of the Community Mental Health Centers Act which began to provide discrete services for children has been dismantled, and while all Centers are now required specifically to operate specialized services for children, the depth and quality of these programs varies enormously.

Mr. Chairman, we are really discussing a series of problems today. We have already addressed the lack of health services being delivered to our mentally ill and developmentally disabled children. We will now address the need to end discrimination in the delivery of those services available and the great necessity of providing qualified, trained health and mental health professionals and other specialized personnel to meet the needs of these children.

As we have already indicated, existing Federal programs discriminate against mentally ill and developmentally disabled children. Some of this discrimination is de facto: there are not sufficient numbers of professionals trained to meet the special needs of these special populations; so such children go untreated by default. To correct this injustice, more professionals must be properly trained to meet the needs of these youngsters. Yet, some of the discrimination is de jure: mental illnesses are deliberately excluded from certain service or reimbursement programs, based upon the argument that a disease of the mind is not the same as a broken arm. Many regard the treatment of mental illness as a luxury, perhaps because they are uncomfortable with coming to grips with slaying the mythical dragon of "Bedlam" and "the snake pit." But, that dragon must be slain if millions of our nation's children are going to be given a fair and equal opportunity to partake in the conduct of everyday life.

We know that such discrimination is unlawful under the Rehabilitation Act. But more than unlawful, such discrimination is expensive—both in economic and human terms.

It has been demonstrated that treatment for mental illness can actually reduce other physical health care costs by as much as 50 percent. A study conducted by Blue Cross of Western Pennsylvania shows that even when the cost of the additional treatment for mental illness was factored in, the overall cost to the insurer for all health care was reduced by 31 percent when mental illness treatment was reimbursed. Moreover, in a study detailed at the April 1978 Southwestern Psychological Association Meeting, it was found that among children specifically, the presence of reimbursable mental health care reduced the mean number of physician visits for other purposes by 36 percent. Indeed, a matched control group, for whom such mental health services were not made available, suffered an increase of 30 percent in the mean number of other physician visits during the same period. Thus, each study indicates that appropriate treatment for mental illness actually provides a cost savings for other medical care services.

Conversely, failure to provide treatment for the child diagnosed as mentally ill, or developmentally disabled, while saving dollars initially, will clearly cost the Federal government more in the long-run, whether in future, higher health care costs or in social service or juvenile justice system dollars.

Early intervention can prevent the development of some forms of developmental disability (such as mental retardation and birth

defects caused by poor prenatal care); can dramatically reduce the severity of the disability (as in seizure disorders, which if untreated will increase in frequency and intensity); can compensate for disability-produced impairments (as in the case of children with cerebral palsy who, with appropriate therapy, can be helped to reduce or ameliorate communication and motor difficulties); and can reverse symptoms (as in the case of those autistic children whose cognitive and behavioral functioning have improved significantly as a result of neurological intervention). Each of these can and does save medical costs.

It should be realized that early and appropriate intervention can preclude the subsequent development of a chronic mental illness. The prevalence of learning disabilities and subsequent academic difficulties are heightened with the presence of untreated mental illness among children. Without early treatment, such children often do not succeed academically, often drop out of school, and often become a burden upon either the social service or juvenile justice system.

Your Subcommittee will be considering several pieces of legislation in the coming weeks and months which address many of the problems I have described regarding the need for appropriate treatment of, and appropriate access to services for, mental illnesses and developmental disabilities. The children who suffer have all too often been relegated to second class citizenship in programs for children which themselves are afterthoughts, appended to larger health programs. Legislation such as the Child Health Assurance Program (CHAP) could provide a first step to ensure that developmentally disabled and mentally ill children do not suffer from discriminatory provisions.

We also encourage an examination by this subcommittee of Crippled Children's Services to make them more equitable, particularly for children who are recipients of Supplemental Security Income.

As you consider the subject of National Health Insurance, we ask you to assure that mentally ill and developmentally disabled children will be given equal consideration.

The Community Mental Health Systems Act, to implement major recommendations of the President's Commission on Mental Health, will be referred to this Subcommittee. We thus ask that you assure that in this legislation, children are not, once again, an afterthought.

Your oversight this year and reauthorization next year of the health manpower program can assure, through appropriate amendments, that the CHAP and Systems Acts can have appropriately and highly trained mental health care providers available to meet the special needs of mentally ill and developmentally disabled children. We believe it critical not only to assure services to such children, but also to assure that there are the trained personnel available to provide the services about which we have been speaking this morning.

We urge you to bear in mind, as we do daily, the need for Congressional concern about our special children. As the President's Commission on Mental Health stated: "What we need is a more comprehensive and coordinated public and private strategy for financing mental health care services where payment is based upon the need for care, not diagnosis." We urge you to remember the needs of developmentally disabled and mentally ill children as you draft child health legislation, both today and in the coming years. We urge you to make children not an afterthought, but foremost in your minds as you consider the health needs of the American people, for without our children—our healthy children—we are indeed a poorer nation. ●



## VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK

**HON. MARIO BIAGGI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1979

• Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress and the entire Nation is honoring Vietnam veterans. I am proud to join in recognizing the outstanding service of veterans who served during the Vietnam era.

Two and a half million veterans served in Vietnam, and another 6 million served elsewhere during the Vietnam era. Many of these men and women are justifiably embittered by the seeming abandonment of their well-being by the very same Nation for which they so courageously jeopardized their lives.

Certainly, we can understand their frustration when we look at some telling facts. The most recent Census Bureau figures show that in a single year 1 million Vietnam veterans were unable to find jobs that kept them employed for a full year. Many failed to earn an adequate wage, with 855,000 earning less than \$4,000. Unemployment among minority veterans remains extremely high at 14.1 percent.

Educational aid has also been lacking. In 1966, when the Vietnam era had produced over 1 million veterans, the GI bill paid only \$100 a month for tuition and living costs. The early veterans of this war were unable to attend the more prestigious institutions while maintaining family obligations. Further, the law's requirement that veterans can only use these funds within the first 10 years after discharge, has restricted the educational opportunities of many.

Weaknesses in the GI bill also provide no consideration for those veterans who wish to attend educational institutions in high cost living areas, such as New York City. This is an issue to which I am giving special attention and I am hopeful that the Congress will work effectively to correct this problem, which faces the many veterans who are attending, or would like to attend, urban colleges.

In the area of health care, veterans have been extremely shortchanged. Already in this fiscal year, more than 3,000 beds and 1,500 full-time personnel in VA hospitals have been eliminated. President Carter's fiscal year 1980 budget only serves to further decrease our ability to adequately provide for our Nation's veterans. It calls for a reduction of 2,100 beds and 1,884 personnel.

The effects would be especially hard on New York. The Bronx VA Hospital would lose 98 beds and 99 personnel. The Brooklyn VA Hospital faces a loss of 60 beds and 81 personnel. In the New York City VA Hospital, 66 beds and 83 personnel would be lost. Other major cuts are proposed for VA hospitals in upstate New York.

Following the Vietnam war, the need for quality veterans health care has increased, while the funds available for providing these valuable services have decreased. Certainly, prompt and effective

action is necessary to correct this problem. In this regard, I recently supported legislation to restore this lost money for veterans programs.

While these lack of adequate services in the areas of employment, education, and health have certainly hindered the Vietnam veteran's ability to return to the mainstream of American life, their major obstacle is an unjust perception of their contribution to our Nation. Due to the unpopularity of the Vietnam war, these veterans have been cast in a negative image that continues to burden them.

At a time when our Nation would rather forget our involvement in Vietnam, it is imperative that we never forget the loyal and courageous service of those veterans who served during that time. I am hopeful that Vietnam Veterans Week will help to encourage a greater awareness of the need for improved services and increased respect and appreciation for those veterans who have suffered both physically and emotionally as a result of their service in the Vietnam war.

While it is essential that we recognize the needs of those Vietnam veterans who have returned, we should also remember those that did not. Some bravely gave their lives for their country, and still others remain missing.

It is unconscionable to think that after 6 years since the official end of our involvement in Vietnam, nearly 2,500 Americans are still prisoners of war (POW) or missing in action (MIA) in Southeast Asia. I have consistently advocated that our Government demand a full accounting of all POW's and MIA's before we take any steps to normalize relations with Vietnam. Past efforts to obtain this information from the Socialist Governments of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have not been successful.

During the prior Congress I strongly supported a resolution, which became Public Law 95-349, to designate July 18, 1979, as "National POW-MIA Recognition Day." I am hopeful that this action will help to rekindle the memory of the sacrifices made by the POW's and MIA's, and create a greater national concern about the fate of those Americans who are still missing in action.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my fellow colleagues and all other Americans in saluting the Vietnam veterans and the outstanding service they provided this country. They must not be forgotten. •

## ISRAELI-ARAB TREATY FUNDING

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1979

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed, 347 to 28, the Special International Security Act of 1979. This bill sends billions of American tax dollars overseas in pursuit of a peace that may be all too temporary.

We all want a lasting peace in the

Middle East, but can we purchase such a peace?

What kind of peace treaty requires vastly increased arms shipments to both sides?

Is it right, when Americans are oppressed by high taxes and inflation, to spend more on foreign aid?

Is \$4.8 billion the whole cost? More sober estimates range from \$15 to \$20 billion.

How stable is the Egyptian Government, given Sadat's poor health?

Do Americans want an apparently open-ended commitment to provide oil for Israel and money for Egypt?

What about the treaty addendums that imply we will get directly involved in another Middle Eastern war? Will Israel really benefit? Is America capable militarily and financially to continue support for very long?

What about the State Department trial balloons about our sending American troops to police the treaty in the Sinai?

I thought we were through with foreign military adventures.

Our colleagues said yesterday that the price of the treaty was cheap, compared with funding another war.

But why does everyone assume we should pay for both sides of another war? Or even one side?

Americans are sick of being the world's policeman and the world's patsy. I predict the 28 who voted against this giveaway will be remembered in the future with gratitude by American taxpayers. •

## JOHN WAYNE GOLD MEDAL

**HON. JOHN J. RHODES**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

• Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that the Members of this diverse and often divided body are able to stand sincerely united on any question. Yet, we have come together in this expression, on behalf of ourselves and our constituents, of our affection, regard, and admiration for John Wayne.

I have been examining the statements that have poured in on his behalf. They are truly heartfelt expressions of affection and respect for a great American. I am proud that my colleagues have passed legislation that authorizes the President to present a gold medal to this distinguished film actor, citizen, and human being.

There are those who like to describe this period of the late seventies as the "era of the antihero," a time of cynicism and questioning of values. But, the fact is that every age, every nation has its heroes—men and women—who exemplify the goals and dreams of their people.

So it is with John Wayne. He embodies the American dream. He truly is a hero, a legend in his lifetime, offscreen as well as on, as his countless friends have attested. As screen-star Maureen O'Hara so

eloquently testified when this measure was in committee:

To the people of the world . . . John Wayne is the United States of America. He is what they believe it to be. He is what they hope it will be, and he is what they hope it will always be.

On screen he is the tough, rugged but humane solver of problems who overcomes villainy and adversity, sometimes at great cost, but always while following a firm code of loyalty, honor, and integrity. Offscreen, he is the same, as we have seen in his courageous and indomitable battle against cancer.

Nor is John Wayne the simplistic man of action he so often portrays in films. He is a thoughtful, educated citizen who understands well, and is deeply concerned about, the issues our Nation faces today. I am proud to associate myself with the action this House has taken to honor John Wayne.●

#### IN SUPPORT OF REFUSENIK

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion I would like to join many of my colleagues who have participated in the "Shatter the Silence Vigil, 1979." Recent developments in the Soviet Union have provided me with strong encouragement to participate in the vigil. In March of this year, more Jews were permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union than in any previous month. American officials predict that a record total of 50,000 Jews might be allowed to leave the Soviet Union this year. Previously, the maximum number of Jewish emigrants in 1 year was recorded in 1973, when 34,733 were finally granted their wish to leave the Soviet Union. This is certainly encouraging, especially considering developments since March. The release of five Soviet Jews serving 10-year sentences for their roles in an alleged hijacking attempt in 1970 coincided with the arrival of several of my colleagues in the Soviet Union in April and has provided impetus to our hopes. The recent disclosure that Anatoly Scharansky and 11 other prominent political prisoners might soon be freed is even more encouraging.

With the impending meeting between the leaders of our two nations, I feel we can expect significant concessions from the Soviet Union in the form of increased emigration opportunities for Soviet Jews. The Union of Council for Soviet Jews has characterized the aforementioned improvements in emigration as "inadequate, but constructive," an accurate description. It is my fond hope that these events are only indicative of a trend which will result in the emigration of greater numbers of Soviet Jews and the observance of the Helsinki Final Act by Soviet Officials.

But I do not address my colleagues today to remind them of the plight of the

Soviet "refuseniks" of which we are all well aware. Rather I wish to call your attention to one individual who is a leading "refusenik" and has been the victim of Soviet evasion of the Helsinki Final Act. I want to inform you of the predicament of Vladimir Prestin. Vladimir, an electrical engineer, was born in December 1934. He is married to Elena and has one son, Mikhail who is 13. The family originally applied for emigration in November 1970 and were refused permission in February of 1971. This was their first rejection. There have been many since.

Before applying for emigration, Vladimir worked in closed institutions in various capacities, from senior engineer to chief of laboratory. He wrote several articles and has three patents. Since 1969, he has not worked on any projects that could be considered as being of a "secret nature." Yet, this was the reason provided for his denial of emigration. Shortly after applying for emigration Vladimir was forced to resign from his position. He now works doing menial work in a factory.

Since 1970, he has been active and outspoken on the issue of human rights in the Soviet Union. He has been especially vocal on the issue of the rights of Soviet Jews to their own culture and their own self-expression. As a leading "refusenik," Prestin has had his phone disconnected and has been subjected to constant harassment and frequent arrests. However, this persecution has not intimidated Prestin, and in this regard he exemplifies the "refuseniks."

It is my earnest hope that the "Shatter the Silence Vigil, 1979" will help to end the plight of Vladimir Prestin. Only through the release of this man and other Soviet prisoners of conscience can we be convinced of Soviet sincerity on this crucial issue of human rights.●

#### VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK

### HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1979

● Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that President Carter has proclaimed the week of May 28 through June 3 as Vietnam Veterans Week. The sacrifices of those Americans who served in Southeast Asia must never be diminished by a nation painfully ambivalent about the causes and result of the Vietnam war. This recognition of our Vietnam veterans is long overdue and I commend the President for his proclamation.

In Delaware, we are particularly honored to recognize 10 individuals who not only achieved an outstanding record of military service, but have continued to make significant contributions upon their return to civilian life.

Several of these individuals have overcome severe physical handicaps resulting from wartime injuries. Several others have distinguished themselves in public

service while others have made significant contributions to voluntary charitable and service organizations within their communities.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing these 10 individuals who will receive the Presidential Certificate for Outstanding Community Achievement of Vietnam-Era Veterans; including Jay A. Collars, Sr., Richard D. Howard, Thomas L. Lewis, Nicholas J. Lombardo, Jr., Michael J. Malkiewicz, William F. Manley, Joseph D. Schafer, Thomas Spies, Charles Stirk, and Frederick Van Sant.

Delaware is deeply proud of these individuals and is grateful for the contributions they have made to our State.●

#### REPRESENTATIVES McHUGH, GILMAN COMMENDED FOR WHEAT RESERVE BILL

### HON. PAUL SIMON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the Food Security Act proposed by MATTHEW McHUGH and BEN GILMAN, who have taken the lead in an area of great importance. I have been concerned with the issue of world hunger for many years, and I am convinced that one step that must be taken to combat it is the establishment of adequate reserves to meet the food crises that are inevitable in some parts of the world. Mr. McHUGH and Mr. GILMAN should be commended for their leadership in the effort to create such a reserve. I hope this indicates a growing sensitivity to world hunger. It is consistent with the humane foundations of our Nation.

We live in a country that is rich in natural and human resources while most of the countries in the world cannot meet the most basic needs of their citizens. We are in the enviable position of being able to assist these countries in beginning to meet food needs. We must take advantage of grain surpluses when they exist so that these less fortunate countries, as well as the United States, are not caught with limited supplies at times when our grain is most needed.

The Food Security Act of 1979 would authorize the President to set up a Government-held wheat reserve of up to 4 million metric tons. The reserve would be used only to meet the emergency food needs of developing countries and would guarantee the United States an adequate supply of food aid when the world supply is tight and commodity prices high. In that sense, the measure is also anti-inflationary, not putting pressures on prices at a time of low supply.

This reserve, which would backstop our Public Law 480 program, could save thousands of lives when a developing country has suffered a major drought or flood.

Statistics provided by the Agency for International Development indicate that one of every six people in the world suf-



fers from chronic hunger, a condition so foreign to us that many of us cannot begin to imagine what it means. A disproportionate number of these people are women and children. While mothers in the United States wonder what their young children will be when they grow up, mothers in Africa and Latin America often wonder if their children will grow up at all. One-third of the children in some of those areas do not reach the age of 5.

Since the World Food Conference in 1974, developing nations have depended more and more on grain imports, mainly to meet the widening gap between their production and consumption. The U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization says that these nations' share of total world grain imports has risen from 38 percent to 49 percent in the last 3 years. Both the International Food Policy Research Institute and FAO predict radically increased deficits in the future. FAO estimates that by 1985 grain imports by developing nations may exceed 90 million tons.

Right now, we have more than 305 million bushels of wheat—or more than 8 million metric tons—in our domestic reserve, so much that the Agriculture, Stabilization, and Conservation Service has reached its target and will not accept additional wheat for the reserve. By taking advantage of the current surplus, we can prevent a recurrence of a situation which plagued our food aid program between fiscal year 1972 and fiscal year 1974. During that period, our food aid shipments of grain and grain products dropped from 7.9 to 2.5 million metric tons despite a dramatic increase in the need for food aid. Because supplies were tight, further government purchases of grain for food aid would have encouraged higher prices and greater inflation.

If we were to buy wheat now, we would not only be preparing to help other people, we also would be helping our farmers. The purchase would have a modestly beneficial effect on the prices that wheat farmers receive. These grain stocks would be isolated from the market and therefore would not serve to hold down domestic prices.

I am proud to be associated with the measure proposed by Mr. McHUGH and Mr. GILMAN. This bill is similar to one approved during the 95th Congress by the Agriculture and Foreign Affairs Committees but which the House did not have time to act on before we adjourned. This year, we have the time, and I urge the passage of the Food Security Act of 1979.●

**MRS. REGINA BRODZIK NAMED  
MOTHER OF THE YEAR**

**HON. JAMES J. FLORIO**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to an outstanding woman from my district, Mrs. Regina Brodzik of Camden, N.J.

Mrs. Brodzik will be honored as the "Mother of the Year" at a testimonial dinner on Sunday, June 3, 1979, by relatives and friends. The function is being sponsored by the Union of Polish Women in America, group 5.

A lifelong resident of Camden, Mrs. Brodzik was an infant when her parents moved there from Philadelphia. A member of the Polish-American Heritage Society, Inc., the Polish-American Women's Citizens' Club, St. Joseph's Annex Auxiliary and the Union of Polish Women in America, she has been an active member of the business community since 1953.

Mrs. Brodzik, who resides with her husband, John M., is the proud mother of two children, a son, John M., Jr.; and a daughter, Loretta Blum. She has three lovely grandchildren, Mark Brodzik, Monti, and Tyler Blum.

The testimonial dinner will be preceded by an 11 o'clock High Mass taking place at St. Joseph's Church in their hometown.

Chairing this memorable occasion are Stella Martin, president of the sponsoring organization; cochairpersons Helen Zimolong and Martha Kozloski, who have extended a warm invitation to all members and to Mrs. Brodzik's friends to this noteworthy event.●

JUNE 2, 1946, A GREAT DAY IN  
ITALIAN HISTORY

**HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, June 2 marks a stirring event in the rich history of Italy. For on that day in 1946, the great Italian people gave a resounding vote of confidence for political democracy.

The beautiful land of Italy, washed by the blue waves of the Mediterranean and cradled within the Alps, has boasted of an advanced civilization for thousands upon thousands of years. It may be truly said that Italy constitutes a mosaic of human history. She is a major source of Western culture—her legal system is a model for the West, her language is the tongue of music, and her Renaissance stands as one of mankind's greatest achievements. Yet throughout her glorious history, few more stirring events have occurred than the day, 33 years ago, when the Italian people chose a republican form of government.

Let us recall those early postwar years. In the devastation and destruction of World War II, Italy had suffered more heavily than most other Western nations. During the war, her civilian population had endured privations and suffering even more severe than the German citizens, and in addition, they had suffered more than two decades of oppressive fascist rule.

In the immediate aftermath of war, the most urgent political problem facing Italy was the need to establish a frame-

work for effective democratic government. The task was a difficult one because of the multiplicity of political parties and because of disagreement over whether the monarchy would be abandoned or retained.

In a nationwide referendum, held on June 2, 1946, the Italian people elected delegates to a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution. In the same referendum the Italians were called upon to decide whether to keep the monarchy or turn to a republic with a president. By a margin of 2 million votes the Italian people voted for a republican form of government, which was an outstanding victory for political democracy.

Eleven days after the referendum, King Umberto II left Italy. With the aid of the Marshall plan, the determined and ingenious Italian people launched upon a great period of economic, political, and social progress. In addition to outstanding postwar achievements on the domestic scene, Italy also placed herself in the vanguard of European integration. Moreover, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Italy has been and continues to be a stalwart and loyal Western Ally.

Mr. Speaker, national parliamentary elections are scheduled in Italy beginning Sunday, June 3, and again the Italian people face the choice between democracy and some form of totalitarianism. Earlier this year, Italy's Premier Giulio Andreotti decided on holding new elections in order to strengthen his coalition in Parliament, and the news reports from Italy indicate that the Christian Democrats and their allies could well take the lead, thus making a more stable government possible.

Last year, I was privileged to be a part of the American delegation representing the President of the United States at the memorial service in Rome for Aldo Moro, the former Prime Minister who was slain by vicious renegades. We came away from this brief visit both strengthened and inspired, for we witnessed firsthand the dignity of the Italian people and their leaders who are standing firm in their determination to defend and preserve the values of democracy for which Aldo Moro struggled during more than three decades of dedicated public service. Italy has always been a part of the Western tradition of faith and belief in the nobility of the individual human spirit, and it is this tradition that will remain of tremendous importance in the continuing struggle against advocates of oppressive state control of individual freedoms dependent on brute force.

As we commemorate June 2, 1946, a proud day in Italian history, I extend warmest best wishes to the people of that great Republic on the eve of their national elections, and to our many friends of Italian descent in my own 11th District of Illinois, throughout the United States, and all over the world. May the people of Italy continue their important contributions to the culture and freedom of the West, to the vitality of democracy, and to democracy's precious ideals.●

# NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

## HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to praise my colleague, JOHN BURTON, for the outstanding work his subcommittee has done. During the 95th Congress, his Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation held a series of hearings on the Northeast Corridor improvement project (NECIP). Those hearings, and an excellent report by the subcommittee, revealed several problems in the progress of the NECIP—problems which had not previously received adequate attention.

Recently, the General Accounting Office released a report on the Northeast Corridor improvement project which supports the findings of Mr. BURTON's subcommittee. Both reports, for example, indicated that past construction and planning problems would make the statutory trip time and cost goals impossible to achieve by 1981. Mr. BURTON's subcommittee report concluded that, among other changes, structural reorganization was needed.

Mr. BURTON's hearings and report undoubtedly contributed to the Department of Transportation's (DOT) reexamination of the performance of the NECIP. The NECIP redirection study, issued by the DOT in January of this year, adopts most of the recommendations of the subcommittee. The Department has acknowledged the problems encountered by NECIP in the past and recommended specific corrective action for the future. They have reorganized the management of the project and instituted changes to eliminate the management and planning problems which have plagued the project.

Our continuing energy problems make such projects as the Northeast Corridor even more important to the Nation. It is necessary to make the needed Federal investment now to insure the availability of viable transportation alternatives to the automobile. Without such alternatives, we cannot begin to reduce our oil consumption.

The Northeast is but one of many corridors throughout the country which have the potential for frequent, high-speed rail service. We must also begin to look at service in other corridors which have the population and air and auto saturation problems of the Northeast. The NECIP is our opportunity to demonstrate that high-speed service can work at a cost the taxpayer is willing to pay.

Strict Federal control and management, and efficient planning and implementation are essential for any successful program. As Mr. BURTON pointed out, these elements have been lacking in the Northeast Corridor improvement project. The Department of Transportation has responded to this inadequacy with

a new organization structure, a new timetable, and new goals.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Commerce, which must deal legislatively with the request for additional funding for the project, I am grateful for Mr. BURTON's leadership in overseeing NECIP. He has demonstrated clearly how the congressional oversight function should work.

I look forward to working with Mr. BURTON and his subcommittee to insure that the Northeast Corridor improvement project is properly managed and that the proposed goals are met according to schedule.●

## A TRIBUTE TO CHRIS FERRAGAMO

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, excellence achieved in any endeavor can be a source of great personal satisfaction, and at times an individual's well-earned honors can spread a strong feeling of pride throughout an entire community. These are words fit to describe Chris Ferragamo and what his successful career as a football coach has meant to the students of Banning High School and the people of Wilmington, Calif. On June 8, 1979, the friends and associates of Coach Ferragamo will gather to honor him for the leadership he has provided in team sports and in the local community. Highlights of this man's career and service to the South Bay area illustrate why he has won the respect and admiration of all who know him.

Chris Ferragamo grew up in Wilmington and attended the same Banning High School where he now teaches and coaches team sports. While attending high school he played varsity football for 2 years. He graduated in 1958.

His education continued as he attended the nearby Los Angeles Harbor Community College for 2 years. There, he played football and won honors as junior college all-America. His formal education culminated in his graduation from Long Beach State College.

After graduation, Chris returned to Banning High School to teach biology and coach its football team. Judging from the excellent students he has turned out, and the string of winning football teams we have had at Banning, he has been successful in both these endeavors. And considering the intensive competitiveness of high school football in southern California, this man's achievements as head football coach are truly remarkable.

He has led his football teams to three city championships, one Marine League championship, and has been named Coach of the Year on three separate occasions. Four of his players have made the city of Los Angeles Most Valuable Player teams.

In addition to his football duties, Chris coached the high school swimming team

for 12 years and coached the Shrine All Star and South Bay Lions games. In his spare time he promotes youth programs. His efforts made possible the founding of the Wilmington Boys Athletic Association. Pop Warner Football and the South Bay Junior All-American Youth Conference have also benefited from his volunteer services.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Chris Ferragamo for his brilliant career as football coach and as community leader. We know that the testimonial dinner to be held in his honor on June 8 is well-deserved. To Chris, his wife, Marlene, and their children Chris Jr., Mark, and Deanna, we send our best wishes for a bright and happy future.●

## WILL ITALY BE DEMOCRATIC AFTER JUNE 3?

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 3, a vitally important election will be conducted in Italy. Voters will again go to the polls but as so often in the past, they are voting for far more than just candidates for office—they will be determining their future destiny as a nation. How they choose will bear not only on Italy's future but that of the entire world community.

The choice is between the ruling Christian Democrat Party and the Italian Communist Party. The Christian Democrats which displace being the predominant ruling party during the past 30 years, have seen their popularity and support ebb and flow like the tide of the Mediterranean Sea. Rarely has their power been challenged as persistently and effectively as during this decade by the Italian Communist Party. The Communists achieved the apex of their power during the 1976 general elections when they garnered 34.4 percent of the vote as compared to the 38.8 percent eked out by the Christian Democrats.

The results stunned the Italian populace and the world at large. The future of democracy for the first time since the Fascist regimes of the 1930's and 1940's was seriously challenged. The Communists were able to exploit weaknesses in the rule of the Christian Democrats. Observers felt then that the true test of Communist strength would come in the next election. The future is now—that election is being held on Sunday.

Yet for the voters of Italy—the issues in this election go beyond evaluating the ideological differences between the Communists and Christian Democrats. The fact is terrorism has emerged as a major issue in the campaign. The Boston Globe in a story dated May 23 summed it up with the headline—"Terror, the Issue for Italian Voters."

The brutal murder of Christian Democrat leader Aldo Moro still hovers in the mind of millions of Italians. It is the most graphic manifestation of the terrorist problem in Italy. Its impact sin-



gularly was immense in Italy but this act combined with the recent rash of terrorist acts throughout Italy have placed the nation in a state of fear. Just in the months of January through April there were some 76 different terrorist attacks in the city of Padua in the Veneto region. These included acts of arson—bombings, beatings, and car burnings. Politicians campaigning on the Christian Democrat line have been subjected to attacks and many officials live in constant fear of assassination.

The combined fear of communism and terrorism makes for an even greater fear in Italy—anarchy. Terrorism in Italy is as real a problem as anywhere in the world. The Red Brigades are as sophisticated a terrorist group as there is—they are part of an overall terrorist network which is growing at an alarming rate. Violence as a means of achieving objectives is wrong in Italy as it is anywhere it is practiced.

The terrorist issue is inexorably woven into the campaign between the Christian Democrats and the Communists. The two main themes of the Christian Democrats are anticommunism and antiterrorism. The Democrats have been much more outspoken in their condemnations of violence while the Communists have displayed a curious silence on the issue. Ultimately the election may turn on how closely the element of terrorism is linked to the Communist Party.

The Communist Party of 1978 is far different than in 1976. It is less moderate—more militant—truly more dangerous. The degree to which they are perceived this way by the Italian electorate may clearly determine the outcome.

I was most gratified by the visit last week by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance to Italy. It came at a critically important time in the election campaign. The Secretary's message was crystal clear—the United States firmly endorses the continuation of democracy in Italy. This Nation so clearly recognizes the grave security risks if a nation like Italy were to fall under Communist rule. In addition to being a close ally of this Nation, Italy is a vital member of NATO and occupies a vitally strategic position in the Mediterranean. Without a friendly Italy, vital supply lines to Israel, Turkey, and Greece could be jeopardized. Of special significance—Italy is the home base of our 6th Fleet.

Democracy must be maintained in Italy. If Italy were to succumb to communism—the domino theory would return but on a much higher scale. The security of Europe would be in the most serious jeopardy since the Second World War.

I know I speak for the concerns of millions of Italian Americans who so fervently hope that democracy will be reaffirmed in the election. The memory of Fascism is not that far removed from the current populace of Italy. Any recreation of this oppressive state should be repelled.

June 3 is truly a crossroads day for the people of Italy. Democracy or communism a stark choice—a decision which only the voters can make.●

## MISTRUST OF ENERGY SHORTAGE

## HON. ARLAN STANGELAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems in establishing an effective national energy program has been the lack of confidence and distrust the American public has demonstrated with the Government and what the oil companies are telling them regarding our current energy shortage. In fact, many Americans do not believe that there is an energy shortage and that as soon as the price is high enough, the oil companies will suddenly "find" more oil. This lack of trust in Government and industry is due largely to the ever-changing figures we see regarding energy forecasting and the amount of domestic crude oil that is, or will be, available. Inconsistent statements issued by various officials within the Department of Energy, the agency responsible for administering our national energy policy, compound the problem and emphasize the need for credible information on our energy situation. The American public is rightfully demanding that they be told the truth about our energy needs and whether there is an energy shortage.

For these reasons, I have introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should immediately establish a National Energy Council. This Council would be charged with the dual responsibilities of restoring credibility to energy data and forecasting and, second, the publishing of an annual national energy audit to inform the Nation of our energy problems and the progress that we have made in solving these problems.

As provided for in this concurrent resolution, the National Energy Council would be chaired by the Vice President and comprised of 15 members selected from outside of Government. Since this Council must demonstrate a high degree of objectivity, it must reflect a cross-section of views from leaders of consumer groups, environmental groups, academic and research groups, labor organizations, and the energy industry.

Therefore, I urge all Members to support this resolution so that we can restore confidence in our Government's ability to accurately assess the energy situation. We as a nation can wait no longer to reach a consensus on our energy problems. In order to assure that our future energy needs are met, we must act now to dispel the existing doubts and answer the questions pertaining to our energy problems.

Following is the text of the concurrent resolution:

## H. CON. RES.—

Whereas the United States appears to be faced with a national energy problem;

Whereas the American people have not been adequately informed of the nature and extent of our energy shortage;

Whereas the lack of reliable information concerning the gasoline shortage and the lack of direction in the development of al-

ternative sources of energy add to the confusion and distrust of energy policy; and

Whereas the United States needs a national energy policy worthy of the support of the American people: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President immediately establish and appoint a National Energy Council, headed by the Vice-President, and composed of fifteen members of the general public to (1) study and consider the energy shortage and its demographic impact, and the credibility of energy data and forecasts, (2) present a written report to the President and to the Congress recommending measures to enhance the credibility of data, and (3) compile and publish a national energy audit, which would be generally available to the public as a current assessment of present and future national energy policy.*

Sec. 2. The Clerk of the House is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President.●

## A PRIVATE BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF MORRIS AND LENKE GELB

## HON. HERBERT E. HARRIS II

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a private bill for the relief of Morris and Lenke Gelb to waive certain time limitations and allow the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to consider and pay a claim if valid to Morris and Lenke Gelb for loss of property during World War II as a result of military operations.

In 1939, the Gelbs fled to the United States from Czechoslovakia upon hearing of the systematic persecution of the Jewish people by the Nazis in Germany. They left their farm and flour mill to be managed by Mrs. Gelb's family. The Nazis subsequently seized the property and sent the family to concentration camps.

In the United States, Morris and Lenke Gelb did not know the language, culture, or way of life which added to their anxiety of living in a foreign country. They struggled for many years. Morris Gelb worked as a laborer for \$12 a week and Lenke Gelb washed clothes and scrubbed floors. Mrs. Gelb now suffers from arthritis and ill health as a result of her labors during this difficult period.

After the war ended, the Gelbs learned that their farm and mill were destroyed and that the Soviet Union had annexed part of Czechoslovakia. Members of their family had perished in concentration camps. As a result, they decided to remain in the United States.

Because of the shock over the loss of family and property, the Gelbs did not file a claim under the time limit imposed by the War Claims Act of 1948. This shock resulted in deep depression and repression of all matters concerning these losses. The failure to file a claim was not due to simple neglect, but as a result of mental incapacity for many years following the traumatic events that took place during the war. I urge the favorable consideration of this bill.●

VIETNAM VETERANS EDUCATION,  
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT**HON. W. G. (BILL) HEFNER**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the President have called on the American people this week to honor the service and accomplishments of the Vietnam-era veteran. The vast majority of those who served in the Armed Forces from 1964 to 1975 have established a good record for themselves in civilian life. The median annual income of Vietnam-era veterans and their families is one-third higher than that of non-veterans and their families in the same age group. On the average, Vietnam veterans were younger, but served longer, a median of 35.6 months, in the Armed Forces than those who fought in wars before them. Even so, they left the service with a higher degree of education than those who served in World War II or the Korean conflict. They continue to make an increasing contribution to community service, business, and government affairs in this country.

While we applaud the accomplishments of the Vietnam-era veteran, I think it is appropriate to review what the Congress has achieved in providing education, training, and employment benefits to the almost 9-million veterans of our last war. Federal expenditures for Vietnam-era veterans have totaled more than \$40 billion. GI bill education and training assistance, the only major program within the Veterans' Administration specifically designed to readjust younger veterans, consumed \$25 billion or well over half of that figure.

Vietnam-era veterans have made the current education and training program, established in 1966, the most successful in the 34-year history of the GI bill. As of February 1979, applications have been received from 7.9 million Vietnam-era veterans and 67 percent of the 8.8 million total have entered training. This percentage is far greater than the 50.5 percent and 43.4 percent participation rate for World War II and Korean conflict veterans respectively. As of October 1978, nearly 4.2 million Vietnam-era veterans and service personnel had trained at the college level which is almost double the total for World War II and nearly 3½ times the participation rate for the Korean conflict GI bill. This participation rate is an indication that the current GI bill is adequate and meeting the needs of the veterans it was intended to serve.

In 1977, the Congress passed the GI Bill Assistance Act which raised education allowances to meet the higher education costs as well as to bring GI bill education and training benefits up to an equitable level with those enjoyed by veterans from World War II and Korea. This measure increased allowances by 6.6 percent raising the basic monthly allowance for veterans taking full time training from \$292 to \$311 per month.

The married veteran with one child now has more than \$30,000 to complete 5 years of education. This amounts to a total of \$18,990 in monthly assistance checks and a maximum of \$12,500 in loans. This assistance is scaled up or down for single veterans and those with more than two dependents. A veteran with as little as 18 months service is eligible for 45 months of education training.

In addition, most veterans who have suffered a service-connected disability, and therefore paid a higher price because of their service, are entitled, under the vocational rehabilitation program, to the full cost of tuition, books and fees for education and training, plus subsistence payments based on the number of their dependents.

Education assistance programs, especially in the field of higher education, have been successful largely due to the increased pressure for a college degree in today's society. However, legislation in this Congress will place greater emphasis on the need for alternative education programs. A bill pending before our committee introduced at the request of the Veterans' Administration entitled, The Disabled Veterans Rehabilitation Act of 1979, requests \$11 million to extend vocational rehabilitation, education, and job training programs to eligible service-connected disabled veterans. If approved by the Congress it would raise allowances, extend the maximum education and training time for the service-connected disabled veteran from 48 to 64 months, and authorize an unlimited time period for vocational rehabilitation of the disabled, and other provisions. The budget resolution for fiscal year 1980, approved by the House and Senate has earmarked \$40 million for enhancing the vocational rehabilitation program. My subcommittee is considering legislation which contemplates finding and placing a veteran in suitable and satisfactory employment following the veteran's rehabilitation, and a number of other significant changes in the program.

In February 1975, average unemployment rates for Vietnam-era veterans reached a maximum of 11 percent. The February 1979 rate was 6.5 percent for veterans age 20 to 34 and 5.6 percent for those 25 to 34. While these figures show a favorable overall picture, there are still problems to be faced especially in the area of minority employment. For instance, the unemployment rate for black Vietnam veterans was 11.2 percent or over twice the rate for their white veteran peers in the third quarter of 1978.

The Congress has put increased emphasis on the need for on-the-job training under the current GI bill. Nearly 540,000 Vietnam-era veterans have profited under this program. In addition, the Department of Labor has increased job opportunities available to the economically disadvantaged Vietnam veteran through the CETA and HIRE programs. The Congress also passed legislation offering tax credits to employers who hire disadvantaged veterans, and continues to emphasize the need for veterans preference in Government employment.

Congress has approved a comprehensive program of veterans' rights and benefits to which all Vietnam-era veterans are entitled, the most generous veterans program of any nation in the world. However, the Vietnam-era veteran is unique in many ways. His age, his war experience, his disabilities, his readjustment problems, his education needs and employment needs are all tempered by the times in which we live. The members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress are extending their best efforts in behalf of the needs of the Vietnam-era veteran, while at the same time assuring an equitable balance of the rights and assistance of all veterans. By giving the Vietnam veteran a hand, we invest in the future of America. ●

STATUE TO DUTIES AND  
RESPONSIBILITIES**HON. IKE SKELTON**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today, together with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHULZE) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), I have introduced a bill that follows the recommendation of the Most Reverend Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, archbishop from Newport, R.I., calling for a feasibility study of building a monument to the duties and responsibilities of American citizens. Archbishop Sheen made his remarks at the recent annual National Prayer Breakfast here in Washington in February.

In his message, the archbishop asks:

On the East Coast, we have the lady of liberty holding out the torch of rights and liberties. Why not put on the West Coast a statue to duty and responsibility, in which that light is thrust outward to neighbor, in which the hand is open to feed the poor, and in which we will acknowledge as a nation that no one has a right unless he has a duty to God, to country, and to neighbor.

The message of this legislation is that in order to fully enjoy the rights which our Constitution advocates, each American citizen must accept certain responsibilities—to our God, to our country, and to each other. Every single citizen in this country is an integral part of one of the greatest governmental experiments ever to take place. However, a democratic system is not an easy one to maintain. It takes diligence and work on the part of every individual. For the strength of a democracy, just by definition, lies totally in the strength of the individuals who make up this Nation.

The legislation introduced today calls for the establishment of a six-member bipartisan commission which would evaluate the degree of public interest in constructing the monument. Funds for building the proposed statue would be donated by the public, in other words, no tax dollars would go into the actual construction of the proposed monument. ●



## APPLEGATE CALLS FOR "DECONTROL" OF COAL

## HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say what I have to say straight out and to the point, and will not pull any punches, for the time has come when we cannot afford to be anything less than honest and forthright.

I want to be supportive of President Carter and help him to administer the affairs of state through the legislative process because his is an awesome job and he must have congressional support to accomplish his goals. But, Mr. Speaker, the administration has broken many of the promises that have been made to the American people, and has done so because of the ineptness and lack of awareness of President Carter's immediate advisers toward the concerns of America's citizens. He is paying too much attention to their views and not nearly enough to those of the people of this Nation.

But to be more specific, 2 years ago in his energy speech, the President announced his intentions to double coal production to 1.2 billion tons by 1985, while at the same time enforcing additional environmental controls. To add insult to injury, he now intends to decontrol domestic oil even in light of the Democratic Caucus' recent action last week which urged continued price controls.

As I see it, the President has conflicting interests. On one hand, he emphasizes the need to mine and burn coal to meet America's energy needs, while on the other hand and at the same time, philosophizes that the environment must be clean at all costs. Well, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot increase production by retarding growth. You cannot have a prosperous America by restrictions that close industries.

If the President sincerely wants to shift the energy reliance from oil to coal, he must act in two ways. First, if there is to be any retardation of growth let it be in the Federal bureaucracy, not in American business and industry.

Second, it will be necessary to get rid of some of the advisers and bureaucratic chieftains who do not have the whole interests of the American people in mind. Secretary of Energy, James Schlesinger, is a very good example. He is misplaced as Secretary of Energy as he is not responsive to the American people and lacks sufficient understanding of the definite relationship between the economy, the environment, and the energy.

The administration cannot continue to accept the word of the oil companies as law as to what the oil supply and demand in this country is. It is like the proverbial fox guarding the chicken coop. It is quite obvious that the oil companies do not necessarily have American interests at heart.

On Wednesday, May 23, 1979, the Washington Post ran a story by Mr. Ronald Koven, which quoted Secretary Schlesinger as saying that there was "substantial evidence" that petroleum products that normally would be going to the United States have been diverted to Europe by oil companies looking for higher profits. This should have been common knowledge to the Secretary sooner. I therefore wholeheartedly endorse Texas Senator LLOYD BENTSEN's call for an independent audit of the oil reserves and demand requirements in the United States.

The southeast region of Ohio is blessed with the finest grade of coal in the United States, but because of the fact that our goal is above average in sulfur content and does not comply with overly stringent Environmental Protection Agency air standards, the region is being economically punished. At this point, it appears that come hell or high water the administration is going to achieve these clean air goals even if it has to close every mine in Ohio and put tens of thousands of families out of work in the process, which is occurring at this time. Let me point out, too, that with increased unemployment in the coal fields comes a ripple effect of increased unemployment in all types of businesses and with it less tax moneys for schools and local governments. Let us also keep in mind that this Nation loses between \$16 and \$20 billion of revenue for every 1 percent of unemployment.

What disturbs me the most about this situation is that these problems are senseless and certainly can be solved with compromise and common sense, the latter of which seems to have disappeared from the American scene in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I now appeal to President Carter and ask that he look at this problem. I also challenge the House to take definitive and positive action to allow American coal to be burned, to relax but not destroy clean air standards, and to relax overly stringent rules and regulations that have been arbitrarily established by such agencies as the EPA and the Office of Surface Mining.

Both of these bureaucracies have exceeded congressional intent and I call on President Carter to change this situation which I believe to be within his authority to do. If he does not take this necessary action, it will leave no alternative than for Congress to do it. And if that be the case, I am prepared to introduce legislation that would achieve these goals. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this would not be necessary as I am sure it would be very time consuming and time is of the essence.

At a time when it is obvious that coal is the only readily available answer to our energy needs, it is imperative that the thoughts I have expressed here today be given every consideration. The immediate future of our Nation rests on the actions of this administration. We must begin to use to the fullest extent possible our own natural resources, and this is most definitely a step in the right direction. ●

## WHO KNOWS WHETHER DECONTROL WILL LEAD TO EXPANDED OIL PRODUCTION OR TO EXPANDED CONGLOMERATION?

## HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we have been told that decontrol of domestic crude oil will create a greater incentive to explore and develop domestic crude oil. How? By providing greater income and profits to the U.S. multinational oil firms, whose profits are already bulging.

Yet there is no mandate or directive that assures that this windfall skimmed from the consuming public will be, in fact, utilized for greater exploration and development. We have witnessed the multinationals buy up U.S. coal and uranium mines, publishing companies, data communication entities, merchandising and container businesses, real estate operations, and so on. Under the thinly veiled guise of the need to speed development and application of an energy-conserving concept in electric motors, Exxon has offered \$1.16 billion for Reliance Electric Co. Reliance has raised questions on the takeover. Yet Exxon's "sweet" offer may soften the blow.

The following May 22, 1979, Wall Street Journal article states:

Despite Exxon's statement about wishing to acquire Reliance to use Exxon's electric-motor technology, Reliance's track record and prospects make it appear to be an attractive diversification move for the big energy company.

It appears that decontrol may only speed up the transition of the multinational oil company and cartel into a multinational conglomerate cartel encompassing a good portion of U.S. industry and business. I commend to my colleagues the following article:

RELiance ELECTRIC SAYS IT HASN'T RECEIVED EXXON BID, RAISES QUESTIONS ON TAKE-OVER

(By Ralph E. Winter)

CLEVELAND.—Reliance Electric Co. said it hasn't received a definitive offer from Exxon Corp., and raised questions about the likelihood of a takeover by the oil giant. But Reliance's management didn't flatly reject a possible merger.

"There can be no assurance that an offer will be made, and if so, whether it will be adequate," said B. Charles Ames, president and chief executive officer. "Should Exxon seek a combination with Reliance, difficult legal questions have to be considered," he said. "Reliance has retained legal and investment-banking counsel to assist it in evaluating any proposal."

Exxon announced last Friday that it is seeking to buy Reliance to speed development and application of an energy-conserving concept in electric motors.

There is a certain irony in Exxon's stated intention to take over Reliance because of Reliance's market position and manufacturing expertise in the electric-motor field. For about a dozen years, Reliance has been moving to reduce its dependence on electric motors.

Until 1967, electric motors constituted 75% or so of Reliance's total sales. Currently, pro-

duction of motors accounts for only 10% or 11% of revenue.

Reliance doesn't break down sales by individual products. In fiscal 1978, ended last Oct. 31, the electrical-products group, which includes production of motors, drives, controls and generators, as well as repairs and service for this equipment, had sales of \$368.6 million.

Reliance is either the third or fourth largest motor producer, behind General Electric Co. and Westinghouse Electric Corp., and somewhere near the same size as Emerson Electric Co.

#### VULNERABILITY WAS HIGH

Reliance found that total dependence on electric motors and drives made it highly vulnerable to the capital-goods-buying cycle, because most motors were sold to producers of other machinery ranging from metal-cutting machine tools to mining equipment.

Under the leadership of Hugh D. Luke, currently chairman, Reliance began aggressively diversifying into other areas that were less closely tied to the extreme swings of capital spending.

Major product lines acquired since 1968 include: mechanical-drive parts, scales and weighing systems, specialized equipment for the telephone industry, electric generators and electronic-control systems.

In March, Reliance bought Federal Pacific Electric Co. from UV Industries Inc. for \$345 million. Federal Pacific produces products for the transmission and distribution of electricity. Reliance sold its Houghton elevator division in April to a Swiss company for \$46 million.

In addition to expanding into new product areas, Reliance has worked hard to increase its repair and service business, which is less cyclical than sales of new equipment. During fiscal 1978, service "generated some \$165 million of highly profitable revenues," according to the annual report.

Currently, Reliance is operating at a sales rate of about \$1.5 billion a year, although fiscal 1979 sales probably will be in the area of \$1.3 billion because Federal Pacific will be included for only seven months. In fiscal 1978, sales were \$966.3 million; five years ago they totaled \$624.9 million.

#### STRONG EARNINGS POTENTIAL

Most industry analysts credit Mr. Luke and Mr. Ames with doing a good management job in building a strong earnings potential along with the sales gain.

Fiscal 1978 net income was \$64.6 million, or \$3.96 a share, fully diluted, up from \$31.7 million, or \$2.07 a share, in fiscal 1974. In fiscal 1978, Reliance earned a profit of 6.7% on sales and had a 21.4% return on shareholder equity, well above average for manufacturing companies.

Despite Exxon's statement about wishing to acquire Reliance to use Exxon's electric-motor technology, Reliance's track record and prospects make it appear to be an attractive diversification move for the big energy company.

Reliance common opened yesterday on the New York Stock Exchange just 20 minutes before trading ended for the day. It closed in composite trading at \$47, up \$10.50 from the last trade Friday before the halt for the Exxon announcement. The stock had risen \$2 Friday to \$36.50 a share.

On a fully diluted basis, Reliance has about 16.5 million shares outstanding. If Exxon were to offer \$60 a share for Reliance, the purchase price would be about \$990 million. It's impossible to predict what Exxon would offer, of course, but one study of recent takeovers of major companies indicates an average premium of about 80% over the market price before the announcement. ●

## THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

### HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, Charles Shaw began his newspaper career in 1932 as a reporter for the McKeesport, Pa. Daily News. Later, he worked as a reporter and rewrite man on the Pittsburgh Press, then returned to McKeesport as editor of the Daily News. He then became news director of radio station KTSA, San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Shaw met Edward R. Murrow when Murrow was on a lecture tour of the United States early in World War II, and he was then hired to become a member of Murrow's CBS reporting team that included Eric Sevareid, Charles Collingwood, Larry Lesueur, Richard C. Hottelet, Bill Downs, Howard K. Smith, and William L. Shirer. After the war Mr. Shaw stayed on as head of the London Bureau of CBS for a year and covered the First Assembly of the United Nations.

Returning to the United States, he became news director of WCAU radio and later WCAU-TV in Philadelphia. He left broadcasting to become editor of the New Hope Gazette in Bucks County, Pa., not far from my home. He returned to Philadelphia as an assistant city editor of the Bulletin and retired in 1971. But he came out of retirement in 1976 to reassume editorship of the New Hope Gazette, where he remains today.

His commitment to a free press is as strong as ever and in the following article he outlines some of his views on the subject after nearly half a century as a distinguished and courageous journalist.

[From the New Hope Gazette, Apr. 26, 1979]

AFTER NEARLY 50 YEARS IN JOURNALISM A COUNTY EDITOR REFLECTS ON FREEDOMS

(By Charles Shaw)

I have been working as a journalist for almost a half century—47 years this coming June.

I have worked many places, and I have seen many things. I have worked in freedom, and I have worked under the strictest of censorship—that of all-out war. I have worked in countries where there was no freedom of press or speech whatsoever.

As one who has worked for very large and very small newspapers, as well as those in between, as one who has worked as a broadcast journalist for very large and very small stations, as well as two networks, I feel obligated—perhaps even qualified—to write a testament, a credo, about the role of the press (an all-inclusive term for print and electronic journalism) and the public.

Let it be said at the outset that neither I nor any other conscientious journalist claims any special privilege for the press. The First Amendment, prohibiting abridgment of "the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," was not intended to confer any special privilege on the press.

The intention of the framers of the Constitution was not to benefit the press but rather to guarantee the PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW. And the only way the people's right to know can be guaranteed, the only way

the people can be assured access to information they MUST have in order to remain free, is by ordaining that the press will always be free to report that information.

THE PUBLIC IS PROTECTED BY LAWS AGAINST LIBEL

The framers of the Constitution recognized that not all journalists are moral, ethical, responsible to the public, devoted to the truth; so they did nothing to prohibit Congress or the State Legislatures from enacting laws to protect those who might be injured by untruthful reporting. The result was a myriad of laws protecting people against libel and slander; and journalists support such laws basically perhaps more enthusiastically than any other group. These laws don't eliminate the scandal-mongers, any more than bar association canons eliminate the shysters, but they reduce their number and give journalism a better name than it would have otherwise.

In my wanderings about this globe, I have found it to be almost axiomatic that freedom of press is almost exactly in inverse proportion to the villainy or venality of those in power—not only government officials but the civilian power brokers. When a would-be tyrant destroys a democratic government and seizes power, or when he merely takes the place of another tyrant, his first act is to seize control of the information media.

In 1957, I was in the mountains of Eastern Cuba with the Fidel Castro rebels against the dictatorial rule of President Fulgencio Batista. After the fidelistas toppled Batista, I went to Cuba at least once a month the first year, only slightly less frequently after that, and I was overjoyed at first by the amount of freedom given to the Cuban people.

Fidel Castro once said to me, "We are willing to engage in open competition with those who disagree with our philosophy."

But the fidelistas began to whittle away at human rights. Today, there is no freedom of press in Cuba, and those who once ecstaticized over the promise of Fidel Castro now are disenchanted.

#### THE FADED PROMISE OF CUBA'S REVOLUTION

Last Fall, I received a call from a man named Hugo Yedra, an assistant secretary of the Cuba Mission to the United Nations, asking if I would contribute any of my Cuban memorabilia to the newly established "Museum of the Revolution" in what had been the splendid Presidential Palace in Havana. My son Kip and I went to the Cuban Mission in New York to talk with Yedra, and Kip quizzed him about press freedom.

Yedra freely admitted that the only press in Cuba is the government and Communist party press. What we call a free press, he said, makes only mischief. A free press, he declared, does not tell the truth (by which he meant information which the government would want considered as the truth). Some letters of disagreement with government policy may be published from time to time in the controlled press, but he made it clear that such letters were carefully screened.

We left the Mission with a heavy heart—and a decision not to provide anything for the Museum of the Revolution. Kip and I both had been in Cuba during the early months of the Revolution, when—except for the summary trials and executions of Batista war criminals who undoubtedly deserved severe punishment but whose disposition did taint the Revolution even though the summary action probably averted a terrible blood bath—there was an air of Camelot. We had hoped that Cuba would be an example to people ruled by tyrants throughout Latin America. But Fidel finally denied the Cuban people their most precious freedom—the right to know.



Governments of the United States have been chipping away at freedom of the press since World War II. And it is no coincidence that corruption in government has been increasing in almost direct proportion to restraints on journalists.

Harry Truman's cronies took payoffs for favors. That knight in shining armor, Dwight D. Eisenhower, had crooked helpers, and now it's revealed that Eisenhower insisted that the truth about radiation effects of the Nevada atom-bomb tests in the 1950s be withheld from the public so that the tests could be completed. John Kennedy had a pretty good record, but he wasn't in office very long. While he was in office, he let it be known that a good reporter in his book was a reporter who did his bidding, he bullied ragged journalists in efforts to gain confidential information from them, and he manipulated the news masterfully.

#### THE TONKIN GULF LIE AND ITS TRAGIC RESULT

Kennedy's successor, Lyndon Johnson, who stole a Senate election that paved his way to the Vice Presidency and then the Presidency, had cronies who would have been all-time champs in corruption had Richard Nixon not come along.

Johnson did outdo Nixon in one lie, however: his absolutely false report that North Vietnamese warships had attacked United States shipping in the Gulf of Tonkin—a report that mobilized considerable public opinion behind our intervention in the Vietnamese civil war with the loss of thousands of lives. That lie—this tragic denial of the public's right to know—was a much more impeachable offense than Nixon's cover-up of Watergate, reprehensible though the cover-up was.

And who exposed the Watergate cover-up? Not the politicians, not the lawyers who decry freedom of press, but newspaper reporters from The Washington Post, The New York Times and other journals.

In desperation, voters turned against Nixon's successor—the apparently honest Gerald Ford—to elect a born-again Christian who promised that "I will never lie to you"—James Earle Carter, officially Jimmy, who is so obviously confused and often unable to translate orders from his bosses in the Tri-lateral Commission that one never knows whether he's lying or telling the truth. The record shows, however, that he has not kept his promise never to lie, any more than he has kept other promises that might well have been made to win him votes as a populist but not to have been kept.

#### THE POWERS-THAT-BE JOIN TO LIMIT FREEDOM

And the worse things get, the more the powers-that-be—the Executive Department, the Congress, the Courts and the leaders of business, industry and organized labor—combine to limit the ability of the press to tell it as it is.

They are nibbling at the edges, as some New Hope visitors nibble at ice cream cones, and some of the worst blows to freedom of the press are struck by the courts in matters unrelated to government. A New York Times reporter spends more than a month in jail because he refused to help either the prosecution or the defense in a murder trial; the Supreme Court rules that a reporter must reveal his state of mind when he writes a story that later becomes the basis of a libel suit (although the justices do not reveal the state of their minds when they render decisions). The powers-that-be are saying to the press: "Don't take the First Amendment seriously."

Critics of the press cite the fact that Three Mile Island reports in The New York Times and The Philadelphia Inquirer, to mention just two papers, were different. And that's true—because different officials were telling different stories to different reporters. But the officials don't get the blame for the confusion; the reporters do.

It never ceases to amaze me that ordinary citizens will join in warfare against the press when the press actually is serving those ordinary citizens. It must be repeated again and again, repeated without ceasing, that the press has no special status: the issue is not the right of the press but the right of the people to know. We're on your side, folks; bad as we may be at times, we're the only means you have of guaranteeing that you'll continue to learn the truth.

We are most imperfect; we sometimes are a little slow in getting the truth to you . . . sometimes we're a little too fast.

We report good news and bad news. I, for one, derive much more pleasure out of reporting an Easter egg hunt, a soccer victory, an art show, a good play, spring fashions than I do out of reporting dissension in Council. Believe me, that's true. I would have preferred a much more pleasant lead to Julie Fratrik's Solebury Supervisors' story last week than Joyce Overpeck's angry demand, which was at first refused and finally granted, that the people who elect officials, the people who pay taxes, the people who are sovereign be allowed to speak at Supervisors' meetings. But don't blame Joyce Overpeck, don't blame The Gazette for that unhappy news. Blame the reason and support all efforts to eliminate those reasons.

Some Borough officials decided (!) last year that there would be a blackout of news about the police dispute. We immediately proclaimed there would be no news blackout, and some members of Council agreed with our proposition, and you continued to receive the news.

What purpose would secrecy have served? Secrecy never serves any purpose except that of injustice. In cases where unsubstantiated charges are made against an official—against anybody—it is to everybody's interest that those charges not be publicized unless or until proved. We don't carry letters charging that some restaurant's food is lousy, that so-and-so was seen drunk on Main Street, that so-and-so tried to commit suicide. But we do carry everything we can learn about matters of public interest.

There is an old story, you know, about a king who killed the messenger bearing bad news. That is what people do when they, actively or passively, seek to abridge freedom of the press and, hence, their right to know.

In almost 50 years of journalism I have been involved, but not named, in only one libel suit, and that suit was not prosecuted. I have done everything possible to avoid libeling anybody, no matter how reprehensible some news-makers have been. I have been threatened with libel suits many times; and, believe me, the threat of a libel suit can be very chilling. A verdict against a small paper like The Gazette under its former individual owners could have put it out of business. But not one of The Gazette's owners has ever asked me to suppress any information. Of course, I would resign before I obeyed such an order . . . but I never would have worked in the first place for anybody whose philosophy would lead him to issue such an order.

Libel suits sometimes are justified, and those who commit libel ought to be punished. Threats of libel suits sometimes, quite often, are made to intimidate editors, and such threats succeed in some cases.

#### REPUTATION OF UNTRUTH WOULD DESTROY A PAPER

Those who don't like the truth accuse us of publishing certain stories "just to sell papers." That's a favorite phrase of Philadelphia's Mayor Rizzo when he denies police brutality. Of course, we want to sell papers, just as lawyers want to win cases, merchants want to sell their goods.

But, cynical critics to the contrary, our first aim is to provide our readers with the news they need to know as well as news

which is just plain entertaining. We don't dare publish stories we know to be untrue, because such a practice would kill us. A paper which establishes a reputation of unreliability runs out of readers: no readers, no advertisers . . . no advertisers, no revenue . . . no revenue, no paper.

I'm not pleading for the press; I don't have that much longer to go as a working journalist. I'm pleading for the people to support freedom of the press only because it's their only guarantee that they'll retain their right to know. Without freedom of press, there can be no freedom of worship, no freedom to assemble, no freedom to petition the government for redress of grievances. On this hang all the law and the prophets.

One of our troubles is that we are too far removed in time from the abuses which led the Framers of the Constitution to include the Bill of Rights. Our Revolutionaries were fighting against not only taxation without representation but for rights far more than those permitted even to Englishmen at home. They were fighting against such abuses as those which occurred in a trial of William Penn, when the jurors who brought in a verdict of acquittal for Penn were themselves prosecuted because of the verdict. They were rebelling against "Star Chamber" trials—secret trials in which the defendant had no rights. They were fighting against requirements that a defendant be required to testify against himself. They were fighting against censorship of the press, as exemplified by the trial of John Peter Zenger, who by no means was the only editor so censored.

More than 200 years have passed since our ancestors spilled blood to, as they later said in the preamble to the Constitution, "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." We are their posterity, and if we permit erosion of these blessings, we truly are cowardly descendants of the Founders.●

#### MIDDLE EAST PEACE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House passed H.R. 4035, which will help advance the Middle East peace and assist in the implementing of major elements of the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty. I was certainly impressed by the overwhelming vote.

Editorial support for the Middle East peace efforts was featured in the Sunday, May 27 Chicago Sun-Times, which I wish to insert at this point:

#### FIRST STEPS IN THE MIDEAST

The first tangible dividend of the Camp David peace accords was paid to Egypt Friday as Israel gave up the Sinai city of El Arish, which it had occupied for 12 years.

And on Sunday President Anwar Sadat, Prime Minister Menachem Begin and Sec. of State Cyrus R. Vance were to meet in the Israeli city of Beersheba, where negotiations have already begun on granting self-rule to the Arabs living under Israeli rule on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

The events are historic, challenging, promising, foreboding—all at the same time.

The Star of David was hauled down for the first time in this chain of events from flagstaffs on Egyptian territory, in the face of violent opposition from Israeli settlers who were giving up farmland they had reclaimed from the desert.

Their personal sacrifices should be honored. The settlers—unwilling as they were—did surrender what they had sweated over

and laid their hopes on in the higher cause of peace.

Two years ago the event would have been inconceivable. Thus the promise: If irreconcilables can be brought this far, then perhaps momentum can bring them to far more conclusive ends.

But although hope is justified, self-delusion is not. The talks that have begun in Biblical Beersheba are bound to be painful and prolonged. Begin is hard-lining for retention of Israeli sovereignty over Arab territory. Sadat, economically quarantined by his Arab brethren, needs results to retain his mandate for peace. President Carter's players, committed to the mediator's role, require wisdom and patience.

Nothing will be fast or easy. ●

## ALBERT RAINS SPEECH CONTEST

### HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, again this year I would like to have the first- and second-place speeches in the annual Albert Rains Speech Contest of Snead State Junior College in Boaz, Ala., inserted in the RECORD.

For several years, it has been my pleasure to present the top entries of this oratorical contest, named for one of our distinguished former colleagues.

Albert Rains was a Member of this body from Alabama during the period, 1945-65. He retired after providing 20 years of outstanding service to the people of Alabama.

During his years in the House, Albert was regarded as one of its best orators. It is for that unique talent that the Snead State Contest is so aptly named.

First-place winner in this year's contest was Mr. Lane Watts of Boaz. Second-place recipient was Ms. Susan Williams, also of Boaz.

Entrants were required to use the common theme, "How to Dispose of Nuclear Waste." I think you will agree the winning entries reflect many hours of research and preparation on this timely and controversial subject:

#### THE DISPOSAL OF NUCLEAR WASTES

(By Lane Watts)

Picture a catastrophic meltdown in a nuclear reactor spilling nuclear waste. This waste would contaminate the soil or hit a water pocket and send up gushers of radioactive steam and contaminants. If this happened, there could be hundreds of deaths, and even thousands of deaths years later. Does this sound like a science fiction movie or only a horrible dream? Not so, say most nuclear critics. They feel this a constant and realistic threat.

Throughout history, man has had to search for solutions to meet his basic needs. The search for these solutions has sometimes led to difficult decisions. This difficult decision-making surrounds the present day nuclear energy program.

Whether an individual is for or against nuclear energy, the fact is, that nuclear energy is a vital force in the United States. According to the April 1979 issue of National Geographic, nuclear energy is already providing roughly one-eighth of all the electric power generated in this country. With in-

creasing energy demands and the scarcity of reliable fuels, the significance of nuclear energy cannot be ignored.

Although concerned about reactor accidents, nuclear critics have focused much of their campaigns on the question of the disposal of nuclear wastes. The question of how to handle this extremely dangerous material and isolate it in such a way that it will not harm either present or future generations was neglected for years and only recently has been given serious consideration.

There are high-level wastes of two kinds: (1) Spent fuel, of which the typical large reactor produces about 30 to 40 tons a year, and (2) by-products of the Government weapons program. High-level wastes generate high heat and high penetrating radiation for centuries.

The defense waste is enormous and it is stashed temporarily in tanks and burial pits, mostly on three Government reservations in Washington, South Carolina, and Idaho, awaiting Government action on permanent disposal.

To this huge accumulation, nuclear plants have added tons of spent fuel, virtually all of it cooling in pools adjoining the reactors. Yet the fear of radioactivity has focused largely on power plants. It is also true that powerplant waste contains more radioactivity and is increasing more rapidly than defense waste.

One of the main areas of the nuclear energy program that has come under scrutiny is the transportation of the toxic wastes. With the ever-present threat of human error and the possibility of derailments or crashes of the transporting vehicles, several states and communities have banned or restricted shipment of radioactive materials through their jurisdiction.

The problem is not confined to the United States, of course. Forty three countries abroad now have some kind of nuclear energy program. In each case, waste must be disposed of in some fashion. Moreover, all nations that have nuclear weapons—the Soviet Union, Britain, France, and China, as well as the United States—must worry about waste from weapons production.

Nations have tried a variety of methods for disposing of nuclear wastes. The British have been piping low-level waste products into the Irish Sea. The United States Atomic Energy Commission, from 1946 to 1970, dumped tens of thousands of canisters of low-level nuclear trash into the Atlantic Ocean 120 miles east of the Maryland-Delaware coast, and into the Pacific 35 miles west of San Francisco. The Soviets are now pumping intermediate-level liquid wastes into sandstone 2,000 meters deep beneath layers of clay.

These are examples of what individual countries are doing with nuclear waste, but public outcry and increased political opposition have forced public officials and nuclear experts to try to find new and safer ways to dispose of nuclear waste.

In an interview with WAAY-TV, Huntsville, NASA officials at the Marshall Spaceflight Center expressed hope for a plan that involves the U.S. Space Program. These officials stated that there have been plans discussed about the real possibility that a space shuttle could transport spent fuel into outer space. Specifically, this involves shooting the fuel into the sun's orbit where the sun's orbital pull would keep it safely away from the earth's atmosphere. Although not as widely discussed, NASA officials have also expressed the idea of shooting nuclear waste into some of the moon's craters. These seemingly outlandish ideas have been seriously considered because of their relative safety. NASA officials expressed some pessimism, however, because of the incredible costs and the need for the development of foolproof rocket launches.

There have also been suggestions of burying nuclear wastes in non-populated regions such as Antarctica. This has been considered but since this could cause serious international disagreements, it has been discarded.

It is evident that there are no clear-cut approaches to take with the disposal of toxic nuclear waste. At the present, experts feel that deep burial is the most likely solution that the United States and other countries will take. This involves solidifying radioactive waste and encasing it in canisters for burial thousands of feet deep in suitable geological formations. Experts are seeking which formations are the most stable and which would best prevent leakage.

The time has ended where limitless amounts of resources are available for energy consumption. The United States and other global nations are having to explore in other directions for alternatives for their energy needs. The nuclear energy program is certainly an integral part of the present and whether it will be in the future remains to be seen. Critics and proponents alike agree that a satisfactory solution to the disposal question is necessary if there is to be any future for nuclear power in the United States. With energy efficiency as one of the main goals of the nation and the world, a solution to this problem is necessary. With innovation and exploration, hopefully, it will be solved and solved quickly!

#### HUMAN BEINGS—AN ENDANGERED SPECIES

(By Susan Williams)

Whose responsibility is nuclear waste and its impact on future generations? The responsibility is Ours! The question of nuclear power waste is a moral and a health issue. The "Nuclear Age" became of public interest after the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. The health effects of nuclear radiation is still being debated, but there is evidence that radioactive substances remain dangerous for countless generations. One thing that many people don't realize is that radiation affects all living things—not just humans, but also livestock and the crops we eat. The destiny of human life cannot be placed totally in the hands of amoral corporations and scientists.

According to Dr. John Gofman 20 tons of deadly nuclear wastes are generated by an average sized nuclear plant per year. Across the country, nuclear plants are becoming constipated with their own waste. The utilities that produce this waste say it is not their problem to dispose of it. Apparently, the government agrees that it is a problem, but does not know what to do about it. We must realize the seriousness of the problem. It involves not only our lives, but the lives of future generations. Therefore, it is our duty, not only as American citizens, but as humans who live on this earth to participate in finding solutions.

The sad reality is that all energy problems are extremely complex and possible solutions will be just as complex. We must realize that most solutions have drawbacks, and that we should choose the positive elements from each suggestion to create a workable solution. Remember our decisions will affect future lives.

At the present time, burial in concrete tanks is the storage method used. But these tanks last only decades before leakage takes place. At the present time, tanks have begun to leak at the Savannah River Plant. Nuclear waste can be thought of as Pandora's box for future generations unless we act now.

Small quantities of liquid nuclear waste are being diluted and emptied into the rivers but our water can not be continuously contaminated. Other ways of disposal must be found. Many solutions suggested are far too expensive at the present time to be feasible such as the solution of shooting the nuclear waste into outer space.



Philip Hammond, an American scientist, who has worked with radioactive materials for 30 years has a solution which he says can be put into working in 2 years. His plan is to place the waste in canisters which can be monitored and controlled. First place the waste in sealed stainless steel canisters and place them in another container of a durable metal. Then between the two containers have a compressed gas that would be able to detect and signal the development of leaks. The containers are to be buried in tunnels. According to Hammond, the U.S. already has a tunnel system that could be used at the Nevada Test Site. This area has already been accepted and isolated for nuclear residue.

The transportation of nuclear waste to storage areas is another problem. In the transportation 1000's of lives are endangered. Many states like New York already prevent the transportation of waste through big cities. Senator Howell Helfin from Alabama stated that many vehicles carrying nuclear waste are frequently on Alabama's highways. The Senator wants to set up emergency plans to cope with an accident dealing with nuclear waste spillage.

Just last week on April 24, 1979, the Alabama legislature voted 90-2 against the proposal by TVA to locate a nuclear waste center in Alabama. If the proposal had been passed, Alabama would have been the victim of other states' waste. This doesn't seem fair.

Nuclear power is a health as well as a moral issue. We must work together to protect the lives of the future. Because of the controversy over nuclear power, the public interest has been aroused. Yet officials have produced nothing but studies of the problem. Therefore, it is up to us. The decisions we make or fail to make will affect the lives of future human beings.●

#### VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK

### HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize and praise a group of U.S. military veterans who for too long have gone without the respect they deserve. I am speaking of the veterans of the Vietnam war who served their country proudly and bravely during a deeply troubled time in our history.

The American people's feelings about that war are at this very time in a state of flux. As we witness the performance of the victors—the genocide in Cambodia, the virtual enslavement of the South Vietnamese nation, the plight of the boat people, and the warring amongst the respective tyrannies—we gain a new respect for the individuals who served in Southeast Asia. It is most appropriate that these veterans be specially honored this week, National Vietnam Veterans Week.

While veterans of other wars of U.S. involvement returned home to a hero's welcome, most Vietnam veterans were greeted, at best, with apathy by a public anxious to forget the war. At times they were treated with hostility by that public. But the personal sacrifices of our Vietnam veterans were just as real as those made by other veterans. Our country's thanks should be just as real. To do oth-

erwise would be a gross disservice to all patriotic Americans who have served their country.

During Vietnam Veterans Week, I join the citizens of the Lehigh Valley and the rest of the country in acknowledging and thanking all Vietnam veterans for their service to our country. During bitter and controversial times, theirs was a difficult mission. They, like all veterans that have served our country, deserve our deepest respect.●

#### ENERGY SHORTAGE

### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the Chimes, the student newspaper of Biola College, contained an excellent editorial on our current energy problem. It is a very well written statement, explaining that no one group is solely to blame for our present situation. Unlike many editorials it presents a strong, reasoned conclusion: That the Nation must face up to the fact that we will no longer have abundant, cheap energy. I commend the editorial to my colleagues:

#### PLACING THE BLAME

The events of the past two weeks have turned California motorists into gasoline junkies, desperately prowling the streets in search of another fix of gasoline. Sales of bicycles, siphon hoses, locking gas caps and gas cans have boomed, and public transportation facilities have been overrun with commuters trying to save the precious substance.

The news media have leveled charges and counter-charges as to who is responsible for the mess we are in. The oil companies, the Congress, the Department of Energy, President Carter, consumers and even the Ayatollah Khomeini (who, according to humorist Art Buckwald, started the whole crisis, and doesn't even own a car) have all been blamed for the long lines we sit and fume in.

As our anger over the situation turns to resignation, we confess we are very frustrated about the lack of straight answers we are getting. The lines are still long and there are serious doubts there will be enough gas to last through the summer months.

Our frustration grows as we hear rumors, mostly unfounded, that the oil companies are either withholding crude oil from production or are storing vast quantities of gas in abandoned gas stations or in huge tanks in the desert until the price reaches a dollar a gallon or more.

We also wonder why California has so far borne the brunt of the long lines and endless waits. Reports from across the country indicate most states have been spared the long lines, but indications now are the rest of the country is beginning to catch up with us.

We cannot place the blame for the gas crisis of '79 on any one party. The industry, government and we the consumers must all shoulder some of the blame. The odd-even plan and the executive order signed by Gov. Brown Tuesday ordering larger gas stations to remain open either Saturday or Sunday may help alleviate some of the long lines.

President Carter said Tuesday, "It's almost heartbreaking to have an issue, which festers like a cancer, carrying on from one month to another, sapping away the basic strength

of our nation. The American people still refuse to face the inevitable prospect of an energy shortage." American motorists still drive as if gas was 27 cents a gallon. By eliminating all unnecessary driving and switching to alternate forms of transportation whenever possible, most drivers could reduce their fuel consumption by at least 10 percent, the amount at least one major refiner (Standard Oil of California-Chevron) plans to cut its dealers' June allocation.

We have said it before, and we will say it again: it is time for us to realize the era of cheap energy has come to an end. The choice is ours, we can either make moderate changes in our lifestyle now to deal with the realities of the world energy situations, or continue blindly down the road to ruin as a country by continuing our wasteful habits.●

#### HANDGUN VIOLENCE CLAIMS 601 LIVES IN APRIL

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 months I have introduced into the RECORD a list of all the persons who have been reported by the media as having been killed by handguns. This grisly statistic should serve as evidence to all that the time is now to enact intelligent legislation designed to end the spiral of violent deaths resulting from the unchecked proliferation of handguns.

Since January 1 of this year, Mr. Speaker, 2,475 persons have died because of handgun violence. For the third month in a row, more than 600 persons have been killed by handguns across America.

Several bills to this end have been introduced in this Congress. Until we have a sensible Federal gun-control law, I will continue to publish this macabre list of handgun victims compiled monthly by Handgun Control, Inc. Their report for the month of April follows:

#### 601 AMERICANS DIE FROM HANDGUN FIRE

Handgun fire killed at least 601 Americans in April. Those reported dead included 13 children, age 12 or under and 31 senior citizens age 60 or over. Since January 1, 1979 at least 2,475 Americans were killed by handguns.

Among those who lost their lives because of handgun violence:

Temple, Tex.—23-year-old Mary Lou Tris-tain was shot to death by her 5-year-old daughter. They were in a friend's car when her daughter discovered a handgun under the seat. Thinking it was a toy, she pointed it at her mother and fired.

Wichita, Kans.—53-year-old Fred Gilmore was shot to death after an argument over a game of dominoes.

Cincinnati, Ohio.—64-year-old Dr. S. Gregory Miceli was shot to death by a former patient who may have been distraught over an incurable disease.

New Orleans, La.—Ronald Banks, 45, a professor at the University of Maine died on his way to a historical conference after being shot in the face during a robbery attempt.

Dekalb, Ga.—4-year-old Shadrack Neilums was accidentally shot and killed while playing with a pistol found in his father's car.

#### ROLL OF HANDGUN DEAD

Alabama (20)

Nora Banks, Huntsville; Harold Brewster, Jr., Huntsville; Jeffrey Brown, Birmingham;

Joe Brown, Birmingham; David Burtram, Birmingham; Clyde Davis, Montgomery; Robert L. Davis, Birmingham; Scott Deroo, Huntsville; Bobby Dover, Fort Payne; Gerry Harris, Decatur; Joseph Law, Mobile; Pinkard Lockett, Jr., Mobile; Henry Nelson, Birmingham; Rothal Reed, Jr., Huntsville; Richard Stovall, Birmingham; Sadie Thomas, Jasper; Henry Vanderbilt, Birmingham; Ronald White, Birmingham; Ernest Williams, Birmingham; Barbara Young, Mobile.

#### Alaska (3)

Rick Adair, Juneau; Jimmie Kennedy, Juneau; Louis Sorenson, Juneau.

#### Arizona (2)

John Kuslan, Tucson; Walter Norberry, Jr., Flagstaff.

#### Arkansas (10)

James Andrews, Little Rock; James Broadway, Benton; Ricardo Dixon, Blytheville; Henry McCoy, West Memphis; Aljuray Sission, Pine Bluff; Irma Wright, West Memphis; Alfonso Wyatt, Newport; Alfonso Wyatt, Jr., Newport; Markich Wyatt, Newport; Tammy Wyatt, Newport.

#### California (98)

George Allen, Sacramento; Michael Anaya, San Diego; Irma Arredondo, Lemoore; Guillermo Arellano, San Francisco; Marcia Ballenger, Manteca; William Ballenger, Manteca; Francisco Barragan, Alhambra; George Barthel, Los Angeles; Edward Bedford, Los Angeles; Marcel Bejare, South Lake Tahoe; Cyndee Marie Bordeaux, Orland; Richard Brown, North Shore; Felix Campos, Burbank; Eloy Cavazos, Dinuba; Rosita Celaya, Indio; J. B. Colbert, Oakland; George Colon, Forestville; Darrell Crist, Fresno; Alfred Cruz, El Centro; Vera Daniels, Los Angeles.

Kevin Davis, Oakland; Christius Demone, Joshua Tree; Paul Duncan, Oroville; J. C. English, Fresno; Henry Joseph Evon, Long Beach; Jack Fero, Los Angeles; Whitney Ford, San Rafael; Mark Frishman, Los Angeles; Eugene Garcia, Anaheim; Thomas Gittings, Oxnard; Charlene Glover, Fresno; Jesus Gonzalez, Santa Fe Springs; Hurley Graffius, Los Angeles; Billy Graves, Torrance; Robert Greene, Martinez; Freddie Guerrero, Fresno; Gunther Herrmann, San Jose; Melvin Hudson, Sacramento; Connie Holtz, Long Beach; Armando Hovey, Angelino Hts.

Frederick Howe, Jr., San Jose; Ora Jackson, Pasadena; Helen Jeffers, Scotts Valley; Kris Johnson, San Francisco; Mildred Johnson, Richmond; Larry Jung, Oakland; Alfred Kelley, Stockton; Kevin Koontz, Anaheim; Gary G. Lilly, Los Angeles; Felimon Lopes, Hanford; Michael Lopez, Oakland; Victor Lopez, La Palma; Lucy Macias, San Diego; Exell Marshall, Jr., Stockton; Eloise Marinelli, Salinas; James N. McCormick, Woodland; Carol McLeod, Pittsburgh; Earl McMillan, Sacramento; Lotupo Moafunua, San Mateo; Martin Moreno, San Diego.

Gregory Morgan, Castro Valley; Able Navarrete, Torrance; Thomas Nelson, San Francisco; Newman Osebor, San Diego; Glenda Pearson, San Bernardino; Carlos Raguindin, Long Beach; Raguindin child, first name not known, Long Beach; Raguindin child, first name not known, Long Beach; Audrey Ramirez, Delano; Gilbert Rangel, Gardena; Clarence Richmond, Fairfield; Jose Rivera, Santa Maria; John Robinson, Lancaster; Larry Rutherford, San Bruno; Irma Santana, Long Beach; Fred Saudeda, San Jose; Edward Scott, Norco.

William Simpson, Hacienda Hts.; Vernon Stewart, Long Beach; Michael Stubbs, Inglewood; Albert Taylor, East Campton; Arthur Ugarte, Watsonville; Manuel Valdez, Long Beach; Joe Venegas, Los Angeles; Aaron Walker, Mission Viejo; Burgess Warren, Lemoore; Martha West, Oakland; William Wheeling, Los Angeles; Hans Willems, San Francisco; Eugene Woods, Englewood; Julian W. Young, Monterey; unidentified female,

San Jose; unidentified male, Fresno; unidentified male, Kings Beach; unidentified male, Sacramento; unidentified male, San Jose; unidentified male, Watsonville.

#### Colorado (13)

Bruce Abbott, Golden; Gino Atencio, Denver; Jo Anne Baugh, Grand Junction; Charles Bosher, Jr., Loveland; Jeanette Jones, Aurora; Tennie Moore, Denver; Becky Kuhns, Denver; William O'Leary, Florence; Rita Sargent, Lakewood; Dale Stienle, Colorado Springs; Martha Strohecker, Vail; Daniel Upson, Denver; unidentified male, Colorado Springs.

#### Connecticut (3)

Leslie Clark, Waterbury; Edward Cody, Waterbury; William West, Waterbury.

#### District of Columbia (2)

Kimberley Acquard; Alfred Green.

#### Florida (22)

Oscar Alvarez, Miami; Joanne Bartleson, West Melbourne; Debbie Burns, Fort Lauderdale; Mildred Frazier, Sarasota; Augusta Gill, Fort Myers; Robert Gray, Ocala; William Gray, Ocala; Dwight Hall, Fort Myers; Veronica Hicks, Mary Esther; Willie Johnson, Clewiston; Thomas Little, Orlando; Carol Pettis, St. Petersburg.

Eugene South, Homeland; Billy Turk, Gainesville; Edgar Vandall, Cape Coral; Domingo Veiguela-Vlor, Miami; James Westberry, Clewiston; Thomas Williams, Mary Esther; Edgar Witt, Titusville; unidentified female, West Melbourne; unidentified male, Daytona Beach; unidentified male, Homestead; unidentified male, Orlando.

#### Georgia (15)

Robert Banks, Commerce; James Bowers, Columbus; David Carter, Logan; Ron Carter, Atlanta; Edward Efel, Stateboro; John Ghant, Augusta; Charles Herrington, Savannah; James Lawrence, Summerville; Richard Leonard, Augusta; Michael Morrison, Gainesville; Leland Moore, Toccoa; Shadrack Nelums, Decatur; Freddy Rozier, Wrightsville; Earl Snellgrove, Milledgeville; Eloise Snellgrove, Milledgeville.

#### Hawaii (1)

Kaneohe Marine, Honolulu.

#### Idaho (3)

Daniel Kennedy, Paul; Laura Lacey, Ashton; David Leonard, Moscow.

#### Illinois (17)

Cindy Cannon, Chicago; Frank D'Alessandro, Chicago; Ramon Cruz, Chicago; Dwight Frick, Chicago; Steven Forsy, Chicago; Carl Gaimari, Chicago; Joseph Garcia, Chicago; Donald Irvin, Chicago; Charles Johnson, Chicago; Cleveland Lampkin, Paxton; Davis Lampkin, Paxton; Isaac Negron, Chicago; Ralph Negron, Chicago; Enrique Sierra, Chicago; Mantel Surall, Chicago; Jerry Sykes, Chicago; Donald Vice, Paxton.

#### Indiana (3)

Renard Britt, Indianapolis; Eugene Graves, Shipshewana; and Dwight Jackson, Richmond.

#### Iowa (6)

Brian Bauman, Iowa City; Daryl Chapman, Cedar Falls; Mildred Cuecker, Nevada; Ady Jensen, West Branch; Leonard Uken, Lemars; and Susan Wheelock, Mt. Pleasant.

#### Kansas (11)

Darrell Bell, Leavenworth; Roscoe Clarkson, Baxter Springs; Judith Douthett, Wichita; Charles Enders, Pittsburg; L. B. Galbreath, Kansas City; Fred Gilmore, Wichita; James McReynolds, Kansas City; Phyllis Muse, Hill City; Matthew Reaser, Topeka; James Rogers, Kansas City; and Jim Wilcox, Derby.

#### Kentucky (17)

Paul Arnett, Mason; Delores Bailey, Louisville; Gerald Brewer, Louisville; Dave Decker,

Somerset; Carlos Holder, Monticello; Homer Jackson, Nicholasville; Vicki Jacobs, Owen-ton; Max Johnston, Henderson; Cecil Lawill, Mt. Sterling; George Lovelace, Lexington; Harry Madison, Georgetown; Jerry Napier, Manchester; Aileen Prater, Lexington; Betty Slusher, Middlesboro; James Totten, Lexington; Davis Vanhorn, Louisville; and William Wilson, Middlesboro.

#### Louisiana (28)

Joseph Alfred, Broussard; Ronald Banks, New Orleans; Peter Bridevaux, Mandeville; Kenneth Cimino, New Iberia; James Cole, Baton Rouge; Samuel Englerth, Natchez; Mark Faciane, Slidell; William Fraering, New Orleans; Steve Graham, Slidell; Wilfred Harris, Broussard; Benjamin Haynes, Baton Rouge; Larry Jones, New Orleans; Wilbert Jones, Carencro; and Wilfred Jones, New Orleans.

Maurice Lebreton, Jr., New Orleans; Debra Martin, New Orleans; Mike Ordoyne, Thibodaux; Joseph Pino, Port Allen; Gerald Poole, Slidell; Lionel Reed, New Orleans; William Rogers, Slidell; Vincent Spizale, New Orleans; Douglas Taylor, Livingston; Melvin Taylor, Shreveport; Robert Thornhill, Albany; Floyd Verdine, West Lake; William Vest, Lake Charles; and unidentified male, Minden.

#### Maine (1)

Paul Murphy, Bucksport.

#### Maryland (13)

Edwin Balls, Baltimore; Jerry Barr, Baltimore; John Beane, Gaithersburg; Maurice Clark, Baltimore; Leo Eikenberg, Baltimore; Carvel Faulkner, Elkridge; Sarah Faulkner, Elkridge; Robert Gorham, Baltimore; Elizabeth Hakala, Columbia; Robert Hazel, College Park; Gladys Nigh, Baltimore; Terry Scott, Baltimore; Wilmer Scott, Baltimore.

#### Massachusetts (8)

Daniel Connolly, Boston; John Donaldson, Cambridge; Louis Guerriero, East Boston; Joseph Horgan, Quincy; John Killoran, Jr., Carver; Aaron Seligman, Lynn; James Sturgeon, New Bedford; Michael Sturgeon, New Bedford.

#### Michigan (3)

Tommy Burns, Laurium; Jane Hulburt, Laurium; Maynard Hulburt, Laurium.

#### Minnesota (5)

Donald Fleischman, Brainerd; Dwight Hall, Minneapolis; Dean Hensel, Watertown; Jerise Mahan, Minneapolis; Rudolph Saucedo, St. Paul.

#### Mississippi (8)

James Botts, Tupelo; Ivory Davis, Greenville; Rawley Flora, Ocean Springs; Cleo Fox, Grenada; Bertha Hudson, Hattiesburg; Wade McPeters, Ripley; Ulysses Smith, Yazoo City; unidentified female, Corinth.

#### Missouri (16)

Willie Bass, St. Louis; Deborah Brown, St. Louis; James Brown, St. Louis; Kevin Burkhardt, St. Louis; Eula Darrow, Ava; Melvin Dickens, Springfield; Teresa Gordon, Jefferson City; Ronald Gusewelle, St. Louis; Buck Han, Kansas City; Sherry Kruggel, St. Joseph; Dawn Mason, Springfield; Kenneth McInnes, Independence; Sammy Nersesian, St. Louis; Samuel Solomon, Brookfield; Don Turner, Anderson; Ruth Walton, Kansas City.

#### Nebraska (4)

Eusebio Balderrama, Omaha; Odell Dunn, Omaha; Ronnie Hoelscher, North Platte; Randy Houston, Box Butte County.

#### Nevada (7)

Rebecca Bynum, Reno; Joseph Eaton, Midvale; Elaine Grimes, Henderson; Nannie Grimes, Henderson; Sandra Ray, Las Vegas; unidentified female, Henderson, by husband; unidentified female, Henderson, by father-in-law.



## New Jersey (11)

Charles Allen, Newark; Joyce Boxley, East Orange; Leon Crawford, Newark; Samuel Esteyes, Newark; George Hamilton, North Bergen; Juanita Hampton, Jersey City; Michael Igus, Newark; Grimal Jackson, Newark; Harry Jackson, Newark; William Nisbet, Newark; Gerard Sica, Newark.

## New Mexico (9)

Lorenzo Alverez, Las Cruces; Reginald Aragon, Albuquerque; Toby Baca, Albuquerque; Leroy Bryant, Clovis; Ray Clark, Carrizozo; Richard Griego, Albuquerque; Anthony Guierrez, Clovis; Rickie Hatley, Clovis; Bennie Montano, Espanola.

## New York (7)

Florence Alden, Yonkers; Linda Darrigo, Newburgh; Edward Jones, Newburgh; Kerry Lynch, Buffalo; Charlie Walker, Yonkers; Jennifer Wardour, Lyndon; Robert Woods, Buffalo.

## North Carolina (11)

Tommy Brooks, Charlotte; James Dowd, Charlotte; Clarence Flowers, Charlotte; Marshall Heath, Fayetteville; Dwight Hoyle, Charlotte; B. J. Jones, Charlotte; Ellen Langford, Charlotte; Ray McKay, Charlotte; Donna Minton, Banner Elk; Johnny Minton, Banner Elk; Vanessa Riddle, Dallas.

## Ohio (22)

Jesus Canales, Toledo; Robert Clos, Cincinnati; John Feisley, Cleveland; Terry Fisher, Columbus; Robert Furey, Campbell; Willie Hughs, Toledo; Page Isom, Columbus; Earl Jones, Cleveland; Eunice Jones, Columbus; Richard Kee, Cleveland; Tom Kelly, Cleveland.

George Kuchenbrod, Cleveland; Chester Labedz, Toledo; Gregory Micell, Cincinnati; Walter Rose, Cincinnati; Phillip Smith, Columbus; Christopher Swidas, Cleveland; Frances Thomas, Columbus; John Vaughn, Columbus; Robert White, Cleveland; Thomas Wheeler, Cleveland; unidentified male, Cleveland.

## Oklahoma (8)

James Bristol, Sapulpa; Clifton Bryant, Sapulpa; Toby Cummings, Tulsa; Tollie Grant, Konawa; Charles Keith, Oklahoma City; Henry Tenton, El Reno; unidentified female, Ardmore; unidentified male, Yukon.

## Oregon (1)

Nels Bailey, Springfield.

## Pennsylvania (22)

Lawrence Brown, Philadelphia; Alfred Clark, Philadelphia; Ernest Easley, Pittsburgh; Stephen Green, West Chester; William Green, Philadelphia; James Harrell, Philadelphia; Ernest Johnson, Philadelphia; Johnny Kerwood, Philadelphia; Bruce MacMillan, Philadelphia; Peter Morales, Philadelphia; Dennis Nabried, Philadelphia; Artist Parrish, Philadelphia; Benjamin Phillips, Philadelphia; Ulrich Richardson, Philadelphia; Al Shelly, Philadelphia; Gilbert Smith, Philadelphia; Lemuel Stephens, Philadelphia; Mark Straub, Pittsburgh; Cynthia Wells, Mt. Airy; Cindy Wilson, Chambersburg; unidentified male, Scranton.

## Puerto Rico (1)

Melvin Wyrick, Jr.

## South Carolina (7)

Michael Crowley, Beauford; Timothy Crowley, Beauford; Homer Davis, Greenville; William Farr, Columbia; Donald Sewell, Columbia; John Taylor, Columbia; Mary Waring, Santee.

## Tennessee (23)

Franklin Acuff, Sweetwater; Robert Amos, Tallahoma; Earl Bowden, Dresden; Karen Burkhardt, Nashville; Ada Chandler, Erwin; Darrell Chapman, Nashville; William Driver, Gallatin; Clyde Furr, Memphis; Gerald Gaffner, Chattanooga; Clarence Gardner, Nashville; Herman Gelsman, Chattanooga;

Artie Gooliher, Crossville; Damon Gooliher, Crossville; Larry Love, Memphis; Doyle Moore, Crossville; Edith Nidiffer, Elizabethton; Columbus Degrest, Memphis; Billy Sloan, Nashville; Willie Smith, Murfreesboro; Jorja Walter, Manson Pike; Harvey Whitaker, Memphis; Ricky Williams, Nashville; Erma Wright, Memphis.

## Texas (102)

Ben Ambler, Dallas; David Arnest, Houston; Ira Attebury, San Antonio; Zachary Baker, Austin; Mildred Ballard, Dallas; Albert Banks, Port Arthur; Jacky Beesley, Fort Worth; Charles Bedford, Houston; Ralph Bennett, Austin; Christine Berger, Dallas; Paul Blacketer, Eagle Mtn. Lake; William Blanks, Houston; Janice Box, Sherman; Paul Brite, Lavaca; Debbie Carmona, Houston; Frank Carmona, Killeen; Clifford Crawford, Del Rio; Hung Jia Chang, Dallas; Jung Mi Chang, Dallas; Ricardo Cruz, Houston.

Charles Davis, San Antonio; Dennis Donovan, Austin; Michael Eakin, Austin; Willie Earl, Fort Worth; David Edgar, Irving; Peggy Edgar, Irving; Bobby Ellison, Houston; Armando Esparza, El Paso; Jose Fernandez, Fort Worth; Darryl Ford, Austin; Elisa Garza, Houston; Mary Ann Gatlin, Dallas; Georgette Gibson, Houston; Pablo Gonzales, Dallas; Rocky Gordon, Fort Worth; Jim Haney, Seminole; Elmore Hardaway, Dallas; Cole Hays, Jr., Emory; William Henely, Houston; Gary Hilliard, Cedar Hill.

Larry Hutzler, San Antonio; Bridie Jackson, Dallas; Claude Jackson, Dallas; Franklin Johnson, Dallas; Roger Johnson, Houston; Vance Judd, Pantego; Jesse King, Jr., Houston; Anthony Kirven, Santa Anna; Ralph Laca III, El Paso; Paul Lascaze, Irving; Steven Magruder, Big Springs; Pedro Mancera, Angleton; John Mason, El Paso; Robert Mayo, Houston; John McFadin, Houston; Facundo Mindoz, Jr., Dallas; Leonard Metoyer, Houston; Kenneth Mims, Houston; Sharon Mitchell, Dallas; James Moser, Arcadia.

Comodoro Naranjo, Houston; A. Nash, Beaumont; Mary Northern, Houston; Ericlea Padron, San Angelo; Lafayette Patterson, Dallas; Curtis Pegues, Lubbock; Thomas Peralta, San Antonio; Hiram Perez, Fort Worth; Ruben Perez, Harlingen; Jerome Plentl, Houston; Norris Prophet, Houston; Charles Randel, San Antonio; Ann Reeves, Big Spring; Tracy Reeves, Big Spring; Timothy Robertson, Marshall; Roy Rotramel, Mineral Wells; Beulah Russ, Fort Worth; Richard Sanchez, Houston; B. J. Sanders, Austin; Delores Ann Simmons, Dallas.

Aaron Smith, Dallas; Aubrey Smith, Ennis; James Smock, Fort Worth; David Stripling, Stephenville; Sixto Tovar, Dallas; Antonio Trevino, Matamoros; Mary Tristain, Cameron; James Turner, Dallas; Gilberto Vanegas, El Paso; Mike Villalobos, San Antonio; Louis Ward, Houston; Bill Watson, Dallas.

Michael Wheeler, Fort Worth; La Charles Wilborn, Hearne; Effie Williams, Dallas; Wanda Williams, Houston; Wesley Williams, Austin; Joseph Woodberry, Houston; unidentified female, Wichita Falls; unidentified Hispanic male, Houston; unidentified white male, Houston; unidentified male, Liverpool; unidentified male, Wichita Falls.

## Utah (2)

Patricia Carbajal, Ogden; David Lopez, Salt Lake City.

## Virginia (21)

David Andrews, Petersburg; Gail Andrews, Petersburg; Carl Davis, Salem; Donna Depugh, Arlington; Carolee Gary, Portsmouth; Jerome Gary, Portsmouth; John Hill, Virginia Beach; Rudy Kelley, Petersburg; Billy Lamb, Alexandria; William Land, Jonesville; Roland Marable, Alexandria; Ralph McFarlane, Arion; Mary Newby, Newport News; Sudie Jo Newman, Lumburg; Jonnie Owens, Danville; Thomas Richards, Staunton, Ralph

Rodeffer, Harrisonburg; Maywood Shackelford, Newport News, Juanita Stallings, News Ferry; Albert Wilson, Rowe.

## Washington (7)

Jessie Barber, Seattle; Mary Bjornson, Tacoma; Ivy Brown, Seattle; Jessie Gardman, Tacoma; John Haarsager, Everett; Gerald Jefferson, Everett; Aaron Kronbeck, Seattle.

## West Virginia (2)

Sandra Brizadene, Charleston; Clye Woods, Logan.

## Wisconsin (5)

John Bratcher, Milwaukee; Eugene Donaldson, Chippewa Falls; John Murphy, Chippewa Falls; Donald Schmid, Milwaukee; Roger Weeks, Milwaukee.

## Wyoming (1)

William Brown, Torrington.

## Late additions:

Frank Flores, San Jose, Calif.; Bernard McIntyre, Norfolk, Va.

## GOVERNMENT PLAYING WITH NATION'S MOTORISTS

## HON. FLOYD J. FITHIAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, a lack of accurate and timely information by policymakers in Government and the general public has contributed greatly to the current gasoline shortage plaguing the Nation's motorists. In hope of correcting this situation, I am submitting for the benefit of my colleagues in the House excerpts from Time Magazine's excellent article, "Playing Politics With Gas," taken from Time's edition of May 28, 1979.

It is my most sincere hope that a better understanding of this complex and difficult problem will lead to rational and effective Government policies to deal with the current crisis and to avoid future crises of this type:

Gasoline prices had already soared to what most consumers felt were astronomical heights, up to \$1.01 per gal. in Manhattan. Many drivers thought they were being charged too much. The enforcement office of the DOE's Economic Regulatory Administration was receiving 500 complaints a week of price gouging. But after auditing 2,000 stations' books, federal officials concluded that most of the nation's 171,000 gas station owners had not raised prices beyond the profit-margin limits imposed by the Government in 1973.

Nor was there anything to substantiate the suspicions of dealers and their customers that the gas shortage had been contrived by the oil companies. Nonetheless, a probe was being pursued by the Federal Trade Commission because statistics showed that gasoline production may have fallen more sharply than warranted. Said Alfred Dougherty Jr., the FTC's Bureau of Competition director: "If this cutback in the production of refined products was not justified by a scarcity of crude oil or other legitimate business reasons, the current gasoline shortage may be contrived." Admitted FTC Investigator Ronald Rowe: "Right now, we have a lot more questions than we have answers."

The answers will not be simple. Oilmen disclaim any wrongdoing and insist that the problem is mainly the result of OPEC mem-

bers' decision to prop up high oil prices by reducing exports. Because oil shipments from Iran take about two months to reach the U.S. market, the loss caused by the shutdown during the revolution—about 700,000 bbl. per day—did not affect American consumers until March.

The American Petroleum Institute estimates that the U.S. now is short as much as 1 million bbl. of imported oil per day. Iran resumed exports in March, but this oil will not show up in American petroleum markets until late this month, which is why Carter and Schlesinger believe the gasoline crunch will be eased in June. But shortages will continue because OPEC nations that temporarily helped offset the lost Iranian production have reduced exports to keep supplies tight.

At the same time that imports were reduced, oilmen say several other factors worsened the situation. Among them:

(1) To hold down domestic prices, the Department of Energy urged oil companies not to buy crude on the spot market, where prices are up to \$12 higher than the world average of \$18 per bbl. There is some debate among oilmen over the degree to which this policy affected supplies. In any event, because of a change in DOE policy last week, the companies are now free to buy on the spot market, though several of them are reluctant to do so until the Government assures them that they can pass the extra costs on to consumers.

(2) With the stock of heating oil and diesel fuel at the extremely low level of about 117 million bbl., the Energy Department pushed the 34 largest refiners to boost production so that supplies would hit 240 million bbl. by Oct. 1. This would be considerably above the 198 million bbl. that the DOE considers to be the "minimum acceptable level" for that time of year. Energy officials are now telling the refiners that they can have until the end of October to get stocks of heating oil and diesel fuel up to the requested levels, thereby allowing them to produce more gasoline.

(3) As gasoline production has waned, consumption has risen much faster than can be accounted for by population growth, which is only about 8 percent a year. For the first four months of 1979, consumption jumped 2.6 percent. One reason is the booming popularity of pickup trucks and vans, which get lower gas mileage than many cars. Another is the growing number of two- and three-car families; according to an oil-company estimate, the number of cars on the road (about one for every two Americans) climbs about 10 percent a year. A poll by Amoco found that the average household drove 20,400 miles last year, up 11 percent since 1974, and that 22 percent of that driving could have been eliminated without "any great personal sacrifice." Moreover, drivers increasingly are ignoring the 55 m.p.h. speed limit; each additional 5 m.p.h. requires 1 percent more gasoline. The gas supply situation is aggravated in the Southern and Western states because on top of all the other factors, their populations have soared (up 1.9 percent in California alone last year), and their cities generally have inadequate mass transit.

There now is some evidence that Americans are beginning to cut down on gas consumption. Beginning in mid-April, sales of gasoline fell about 5 percent below last year's levels. At the same time, crude oil stocks began to rise; the latest figure was 322 million bbl., up from 300 million bbl. in January, when refiners began cutting back on gasoline production. By the end of May, predict federal energy experts, gasoline supplies for California and the rest of the nation could hit 99 percent of 1978 stocks. Still, unless tank topping stops and American drivers practice a little conserva-

tion, the great gasoline crisis of 1979 will continue.●

#### A TRIBUTE TO JOHN WAYNE

### HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 23, 1979

● Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3767 and to join with Congressman ANNUNZIO and others in this fitting tribute to one of the truly outstanding and most amazing people who ever lived.

John Wayne—no two words characterize the term "American Hero" more fully. John Wayne's life, his work, and his patriotism have added richly to America. He has transcended the medium by which he gained his fame and become much more than a movie actor. He represents the culmination of talent, courage, integrity, and warmth—all virtues redolent of the American spirit. In so many ways, John Wayne is a living symbol of the United States.

It seems only yesterday that the "Duke" was awarded his first movie lead role by Raoul Walsh in the 1930 western, "The Big Trail." He made many films throughout the 1930's. Most agree that his first really big opportunity came when that great director, John Ford, selected him to play the Ringo Kid in the landmark western, "Stagecoach." From that time, he was identified as the archetypal western movie cowboy. His vivid portrayal of the ruthless cattle baron in Howard Hawks' classic, "Red River," reinforced that image.

Yet, John Wayne's acting skill has not been restricted to westerns. One of the "Duke's" favorite movies was another John Ford film, "The Quiet Man." In this movie, he portrayed a retired Irish prize fighter who returns to his homeland and there courts a beautiful colleen. Another nonwestern brought him his first Academy Award nomination. He played the rough Marine Sgt. John Stryker in the 1949 film, "The Sands of Iwo Jima."

Nonetheless, a western served as the vehicle for the "Duke" to earn his Oscar for best actor. In a role that seemed written for him, he played Sheriff Rooster Cogburn in "True Grit." His authentic portrayal brought the praise even of critics who for years had disparaged his performances.

Of course, John Wayne's contribution to America extends well beyond the screen. Although many people have disagreed with his views, no one can deny his passion for his country and his willingness to enter the political fray to further his ideals. He has always worked for and with our men in uniform, in peace, and in war. His activities with the American Cancer Society testify to his deep concern for others suffering from the disease that has so afflicted him.

John Wayne has asked that his epitaph read simply:

He was ugly, was strong, and had dignity.

I beg to differ with the "Duke." He certainly is not ugly. But this declaration should be taken a step further. Through his work, and his life, and by giving of himself, he has offered strength and dignity to each of us as individuals and as citizens of a great nation. It is this legacy, even more than his films, that is the monument of John Wayne. It is what all of us and our posterity will cherish for generations to come.●

WAGNER COLLEGE, STATEN ISLAND, N.Y., HONORS HOUSE CHAPLAIN JAMES D. FORD

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of the year when commencement exercises at colleges and universities across the Nation send forth their graduates to make their way in an increasingly complex world. The oldest college in Staten Island, N.Y., is Wagner College, begun in 1883 in affiliation with the Lutheran Church, and now privately operated with a student body of 2,300 on the site of the original Cunard estate.

This year's commencement was presided over by Wagner College's 15th president, Dr. John Satterfield, and heard the commencement address by my friend, Mr. Bradford Corbett, chairman of the Board of Robintech, Inc., and a Wagner graduate from the class of 1960. I was particularly pleased to participate in this year's graduation ceremonies with the presentation of a special citation and honorary doctor of divinity degree to Dr. James D. Ford, the chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The gentleman honored by Wagner College, although relatively new to the House of Representatives, is not a new face to me. Prior to his election as Chaplain to the House of Representatives, he served for 14 years as the senior chaplain at my alma mater, West Point, where he was appointed by Lyndon Johnson at age 33, and was then reappointed three times. Although a Lutheran, Chaplain Ford's responsibilities include service to Members of the House and their staff who encompass all major religions.

His religious background is strongly rooted in family tradition, as he is the son and grandson of Lutheran clergymen from South Dakota. His wife is also a daughter of the cloth, making a total of five generations of service to the church represented by this remarkable man and his family.

Chaplain Ford came from a rather parochial background, having graduated from Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minn., and the Augustana Theological Seminary in Rock Island, Ill. He was a leader in virtually everything—his college class, the student senate, his college fraternity, seminary class, and alumni organization, as well as scholastic awards and sports.

In the field of sports, he has achieved a number of outstanding goals which



are, to say the least, unusual. In the spring of 1976, he captained a 31-foot sailboat, the *Yankee Doodle* and with two crewmen, sailed from Plymouth, England to West Point—a Bicentennial adventure which lasted 51 days at sea and covered 5,900 miles—including a quick trip past Staten Island on his way up the river. Far removed from sailboating is skiing, a field in which Chaplain Ford is a master of ski jumping and trick skiing.

He is a man with a smalltown background, who had the persistence to fund his entire seminary education through part-time work, which, as most of us with college-age children are fully aware, is the hard way. He did graduate work at Heidelberg University in Germany, where he traveled to 17 nations, including the Soviet Union, to broaden his horizons and increase his knowledge of world affairs.

His is the kind of dedication which is so rare in these days of too-superficial education in a complex world. And it is for that very reason that the House of Representatives has made a very wise selection in its choice of a new Chaplain. And for the same reasons, Wagner College has the honor of welcoming to its ranks an outstanding man whose contributions to our society have proven to be most worthy of the degree conferred upon him.

It is also heartening to have such men as Bradford Corbett return to Wagner College, where they received their foundation for their entry into the world of business, to share their thoughts with those who have just begun. I have included the text of his remarks to the graduating students of Wagner College, in the knowledge that his thoughts might benefit some others among the thousands of graduates nationwide:

REMARK. OF BRADFORD CORBETT, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, ROBINTECH, INC.

Dr. Satterfield, fellow guests and alumni of Wagner College, faculty members, and the Class of 1979, thank you for the privilege of sharing this moment with you.

When Dr. Satterfield first asked me to be this year's commencement speaker, I could not help but reflect on the men and women who have stood in this place before me—captains of industry, astronauts, noted politicians and theologians, only to mention a few.

When one is asked to speak before any group, I think there is a natural tendency to look to the remarks of your predecessors for guidance.

But then I remembered I was probably different from most of those who have been in this position, in that I once sat where you are now—as a C student from the class of 1960.

In recalling these facts, I knew my job was to bridge the gap between your seat and this stage, by trying to answer the questions I had 19 years ago at commencement, and the same questions I believe many of you have today—can a person really hope to achieve success in this day and time, and if so, how?

I say the answer is yes to achieving success—if you are willing to strive for excellence in whatever you choose to do or become. You will find that each career has its own measure of success. However, it is important, I think, to realize that these measures must be compatible with your per-

sonal criteria for success. If the two do not match, you may never feel, inside, the success you may have achieved many times in the eyes of your peers.

Class of 79, I envy you! Why? Because you are about to embark on a great adventure—the adventure of life in working America, an adventure as rich as the education you have received at Wagner, as spellbinding as your favorite professor often was, as harried as any final exam, and as memorable as this day will be.

How you perceive the adventure is all important; for I believe your state of mind or attitude, as you move through your working life, will be the key determinant of how fulfilling and meaningful this experience is to you.

Today, I want to share with you some of my thoughts on how to develop the state of mind, which has helped me a great deal in this adventure.

There are four truths which form the foundation of my personal and business philosophy, and, consequently, contribute substantially to my state of mind—a state I would describe as positive and optimistic.

The first truth is that you must believe in yourself. It has been my experience that others will not provide you with the opportunities to succeed unless they themselves are confident that you will succeed. This confidence in your ability can ultimately come from only one source—yourself.

If you believe in yourself that what you want to achieve can be achieved—the power to convince others that their trust is warranted will be yours.

The second truth I suggest is to follow your heart as well as your mind. Your education at Wagner has sharpened your intellectual skills, and disciplined your mind. As revered as these qualities are in our society, I have known men and women who have failed to achieve their goals, because their rational mind would not let their instincts prevail.

I believe our rational thoughts must be tempered with the emotions and memories of our experiences, if we are to act as whole men and women.

Do not be afraid to dare, to risk—to attempt the unthinkable when your heart says it can be done.

The third truth I would like to discuss is not to be afraid of failure. Failure teaches, and learning from failure only increases your capacity to succeed. You seldom hear or read of the past failures of those men and women, who are now called great by our society. Something in the American consciousness does not permit the open discussion of our personal or business failures, even though the end result of such failures often points to the beginning of success.

The fourth truth is related to the third, but is often more difficult to comprehend: that truth is not being afraid to succeed. With each success in your personal and business life comes more responsibility, and pressure, both self-imposed and from others, to succeed again. Unfortunately, the exceptional often becomes the expected norm. However, I believe these outcomes are far outweighed by the rewards of success, and the feeling of self-fulfillment which naturally follows.

Your successes, like your failures, will strengthen you, but in a different way. I believe success makes you more cognizant of the importance of those around you, who aid and share in your accomplishments. Each success also broadens the view of what is possible, and achievable.

Despite the conflicting views of our nation's economists on the future of the free enterprise system, I, for one, know the system will survive and flourish regardless of the number and ferocity of the assaults made against it.

Do not be discouraged by those who proph-

esy a general economic slow down, and possible recession. The problems and conditions which prompt such fear, in reality, present unique opportunities to you . . . opportunities to resolve those problems, and strengthen our economic system.

More than ever before, business and government leaders throughout the country are searching for talented young men and women who are not afraid to risk, to fail, and to succeed.

But, please remember, you must help to make the opportunities I speak of. Others may provide the means to achieve your goals, but ultimately, the responsibility of seizing the moment must be yours.

The environment required for you to make opportunities, and to allow the four truths I have discussed to operate, can only be described as one in which personal and business freedom prevails.

If you are offered to exchange this freedom for security, you will be deceived. Despite our human desire for security, and the efforts of government and other institutions to provide it, the urge to acquiesce—to substitute freedom for security—must be resisted. For I believe freedom cannot survive where security is paramount—and without freedom, real security in your personal and professional life is not possible. The freedom that underpins the foundation of this nation, and permitted the dream of building Wagner College to become a reality, is the same freedom that will allow you to achieve whatever success you may strive for.

Remember the four truths—believe in yourself—follow your heart as well as your mind—do not be afraid to fail—and do not fear success. Stay free.

Thank you and God speed! ●

#### VIETNAM VETERANS WEEK

#### HON. EUGENE V. ATKINSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 24, 1979

● Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak a few words about Vietnam veterans during Vietnam Veterans Week. Too long forgotten by a public that unfortunately wants to forget history's lessons, Vietnam veterans deserve this week of remembrance and commemoration.

However, in line with what Abraham Lincoln said about veterans of another era—at Gettysburg, 116 years ago—we should realize that our comments and commemoration here today fade in comparison with the sacrifices made by our veterans in the hills, fields, and waterways of Vietnam. Truly, the brave soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines who struggled there created a legacy "far above our poor power to add or detract."

We need to shift our focus to the future. We need not only Vietnam Veterans Week, but Vietnam veterans weeks, months, and years. We need to stop forgetting and spend time remembering, thanking, and helping our Vietnam veterans. In the coming months and years, we need understanding of the Vietnam experience and patience to deal with Vietnam era problems that will not evaporate overnight. Above all, we need practical assistance—jobs, counseling, training, friendship—from individuals

and Government directed toward Vietnam vets.

During Vietnam Veterans Week, I salute our Vietnam vets who join the proud line of citizens who have fought for our country in World War I, World War II, Korea, and on other battlefields of the past. And I urge that we rededicate ourselves to bringing them the honor and practical assistance they need. ●

#### NOTED ECONOMISTS ATTACK THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

#### HON. TOM HAGEDORN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, construction plays a very important and significant role in the health of the American economy. When the Federal Government causes labor costs to rise unnecessarily, the result can be inflationary pressures that are harmful to the American taxpayer and consumer. This is exactly what happens because of the requirement that prevailing wages be paid on Federal construction projects as provided by the Davis-Bacon Act.

The impact is increased when a particular program designed to help furnish adequate housing for thousands of Americans is hampered by this prevailing wage requirement. Citizens receive less in the way of projects and unnecessary tax dollars are spent on the higher wages—and this is money that could be used in other ways than subsidizing rates usually determined by collectively bargained wages. Therefore, when the House considers the housing and community development amendments legislation, H.R. 3875, next week, I intend to offer a comprehensive amendment to strike the application of the Davis-Bacon Act with regard to all programs contained in the bill.

Many noted economists have made public statements regarding their views about the Davis-Bacon Act. I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the comments that some of these economists have shared with me. I make special mention of the letter sent to me by the chairman of the Federal Reserve System, William Miller, as well as the letters of two of America's most respected economists, Dr. Arthur Burns and Milton Friedman. Other letters are from professors from major universities as well as senior staff personnel at the Brookings Institute and the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

The letters follow:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,  
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,

Washington, D.C., February 6, 1979.

Hon. THOMAS HAGEDORN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAGEDORN: Thanks for your recent letter requesting my comments on your proposal to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

The purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act, when it was passed in 1931, was to discourage con-

tractors in a depressed economy from successfully bidding on Federal Government projects by paying lower than prevailing wages. The law required contractors engaged in Federal Government construction projects to pay "prevailing" local wages as determined by the U.S. Department of Labor. Today, provisions of the Act apply to 80 related statutes that involve Federally-assisted construction projects, and 41 States have passed laws with provisions similar to those of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since the Act was passed, however, economic conditions have changed considerably. In the early 1930's, more than half of all construction activity was Government-financed and the unemployment rate approached 25 per cent. Competition for contracts and jobs was intense and there were no minimum wage or unemployment compensation laws to protect workers. As a result, contractors were in an exceptionally strong bargaining position with labor and were able to use this power to depress wage rates.

Today, the ability of Government contractors to set wage rates is generally constrained by competition for construction workers from many private-sector projects and by institutional wage-setting practices. In my view, these forces would tend to maintain local wage structures in the absence of the Davis-Bacon Act. A recent study by the General Accounting Office supports this view. Their investigation indicates that contractors tend to pay prevailing wage rates even when a determination under the Davis-Bacon Act would allow them to pay less. This suggests that market forces already ensure that the legislative intent—not disturbing local wage norms—is being met.

Not only does it appear the Act is no longer serving its original purpose, but it also adds substantial costs to Government. The administration of the Act continues to pose difficult problems in terms of surveying wages, defining appropriate local labor market areas and collecting data from contractors voluntarily. To the extent that these problems cause minimum rates to be set higher than market-determined wages prevailing in the project area, the result is an unnecessary increase in costs. In addition, the costs of Government-assisted projects are inflated by the administrative costs to firms of complying with the reporting requirements. While estimates of the cost impact of Davis-Bacon may be imprecise, the available evidence does suggest that it adds significantly to construction expenditures.

One of the most challenging and important tasks of Government today is the reduction of inflationary pressures including those emanating from Federal laws and regulations. To this end, a careful review of the current usefulness of the Davis-Bacon Act—both benefits and costs—is warranted.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to offer these comments.

Sincerely,

BILL.

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE  
FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH,  
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1979.

Hon. TOM HAGEDORN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN: I am pleased to learn from your letter of January 26 that you have introduced legislation in the new session of Congress to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

Like a number of other laws, the Davis-Bacon Act is a measure that has outlived whatever usefulness it may once have had. The Act escalates costs in the construction industry, it swells Federal expenditures, and it increases the burden on taxpayers—all for no perceivable public purpose. It is regrettable that the Act has been permitted to re-

main in force for nearly half a century. At a time when our nation is struggling to contain the worst inflation in our history, it would damage public confidence in our government if the Congress permitted this Act to remain in force.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR BURNS.

HOOPER INSTITUTION,  
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE,  
Stanford, Calif., February 2, 1979.

Hon. TOM HAGEDORN,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN: I am delighted to learn that you are seeking to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. I am more than glad to provide you with an on-the-record comment on the Davis-Bacon Act.

In my opinion the Davis-Bacon Act has had undesirable effects from the very beginning. It has in effect served as a major hindrance to the opening up of construction jobs to all qualified applicants. It is not an accident that the industry which has been most affected by the Davis-Bacon Act, namely the construction industry, is also the industry in which trade unions have the worst record for discriminating against minorities. The effect of the Davis-Bacon Act was essentially to provide governmental enforcement of trade union wage agreements. This has encouraged wages higher than the market would have justified which in turn has meant that the number of jobs available at such wages was less than the number of persons who were more than willing to accept such jobs. Some arbitrary method for rationing jobs among applicants had to be used. Whenever that situation arises, one of the arbitrary methods is to impose the prejudices and biases of the people who are in charge of the rationing.

The effect of the Davis-Bacon Act has been to give trade unions special privileges available to no other groups in the society. It has served to make costs of construction higher than they otherwise would be, not only to deny jobs to potential construction workers but also to deny housing and factory building to people or enterprises that might otherwise have been able to finance them. In every respect it has been a counterproductive measure.

I believe it is unwise to use bad arguments for good causes. The measure should be repealed whether we have inflation or do not have inflation. It does make our total output less than it otherwise would be, and in that way does make the price level slightly higher than it would be, but it is not in and of itself an inflationary measure and its repeal would not be a significant contribution to the reduction of inflation. Inflation is produced by excessive government spending and excessive government creation of money; that is where the essential effort should be directed toward the reduction of inflation. Repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act is justified on much more fundamental grounds. It is a mistake to try to justify it on the ground of a very minor contribution that it could make toward the fight against inflation.

May I wish you every success with your effort.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON FRIEDMAN,  
Senior Research Fellow.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,  
Ann Arbor, Mich., February 6, 1979.  
Representative TOM HAGEDORN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN: This is in response to your letter of January 26, asking my views about your proposal to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.



I have long been on the record with the view that the Davis-Bacon Act serves no useful purpose, and that, in practice, it contributes to the high cost not only of government but, indirectly, of private construction. I strongly support your initiative to repeal it.

Sincerely yours,  
GARDNER ACKLEY,  
Professor of Political Economy.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY,  
Baltimore, Md., February 14, 1979.  
Hon. TOM HAGEDORN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN: Thank you for your letter about your proposal to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. You have made an excellent proposal.

The chief provision of this Act, as you know, is the requirement that laborer on Federal construction contracts must be paid at least as much as the "prevailing wage" for that type of work in that area. The Secretary of Labor has to specify what the prevailing wage is in each case.

In those cases where the Secretary specifies a prevailing wage that is at or below the lowest wage for which any qualified laborer is willing to work, the Act has no effect: Federal contractors will pay whatever wage is required to hire the labor they need, unaffected by the Secretary's specification.

In those other cases where the Secretary specifies a prevailing wage that is above the lowest wage for which qualified laborer is willing to work, the effect of the Act is to exclude from Federal construction the qualified laborer that is willing to do the job most economically. Those who demand high wages are protected by the Act from the fair competition of those who would like to do the work for less. This raises the cost of Federal construction. Furthermore, it reduces the amount of employment available for laborers in the construction industry, because we cannot (or do not) afford as much Federal construction as we could (or would) if costs were more reasonable.

In short, where the Davis-Bacon Act has an effect at all, it is the undesirable effect of fixing wages above where fair competition would set them, raising the cost of Federal construction, and limiting the amount of employment available in construction.

The repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act would result in an improvement in the efficiency and equity of our economy.

I am sure you understand that these views are my own, and do not indicate anything about the position of The Johns Hopkins University on this matter.

Thank you for bringing your bill to my attention.

Sincerely yours,  
CARL F. CHRIST,  
Professor of Political Economy.

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE  
FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH,  
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1979.  
Hon. TOM HAGEDORN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAGEDORN: Thank you for your letter of January 26th and for informing me of the steps you have taken to convince Congress of the desirability of repealing the Davis-Bacon Act.

I am very glad you took this initiative and I wish you full success in your effort. Quite aside from other considerations, provisions such as those incorporated in the Davis-Bacon Act unnecessarily prolong the period it would take for the required overall monetary and fiscal restraint to result in a significant lowering and gradual elimination of our inflation rate.

With repeated best wishes for success of the action you have initiated, I remain  
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM FELLNER.

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION,  
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1979.  
Congressman TOM HAGEDORN,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGEDORN: I agree with the analysis and conclusions of the GAO report recommending repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act. The act unnecessarily restricts competition and artificially inflates the cost of construction projects in which the government is directly or indirectly involved.

The government now is trying to slow inflation and both fiscal and monetary policy are geared to restraining the economy to help achieve that slowing. Any step, such as repeal of Davis-Bacon, that contributes directly to holding down costs and prices, will help minimize the slowdown in economic output and employment that will result from these policies of monetary and fiscal restraint.

Sincerely yours,  
GEORGE L. PERRY,  
Senior Fellow.●

#### TRIBUTE TO E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I join my colleagues in mourning the passing of one of the finest former Members of the House of Representatives, the late E. C. "Took" Gathings.

"Took" Gathings served his constituency and his Nation well. As the Representative from the First District of Arkansas for 30 years, "Took" understood the agricultural concerns of his native State and worked diligently as a member of the Agriculture Committee to resolve those problems. An excellent legislator and a superb human being, "Took" Gathings was admired and respected by Members on both sides of the aisle. He always worked first for the interests of his beloved State and devoted most of his public life toward sponsoring and steering through the Congress legislation that had a profound effect upon the agricultural development of eastern Arkansas.

Unassuming, and possessing great personal warmth, "Took" Gathings was a most persuasive proponent of the virtues of rural America.

He is best known by his colleagues for his role in the sponsorship and passage of three major acts affecting cotton and rice allotments, for bringing natural gas to eastern Arkansas, and for development and construction projects across the Mississippi and Arkansas Rivers.

In the passing of "Took" Gathings, Arkansas has lost a fine public servant, and the Nation, a distinguished, patriotic American. My wife, Millie joins me in extending our deep condolences to "Took's" lovely wife, Tolise, and his children.●

#### THE SEAWAY, 20 YEARS LATER

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, 20 years ago this spring, offered the prospect of a rebirth of the once great ports of the Great Lakes. The Seaway was a dream for over 40 years. Under the vigorous and visionary leadership of Congressman John A. Blatnik, the Seaway became a reality in the 6-year period, 1953-59.

The Seaway symbolized the enormous good will between the partners in that spectacular construction project—the United States and Canada.

President Eisenhower and Queen Elizabeth II met at the Seaway to launch a new era for the ports of each nation's heartland.

Twenty years later, the Seaway has some critics who argue that because the Seaway has not fulfilled the most expensive dreams of its early supporters, it has been a failure.

For those of us who have seen the growth of Great Lakes ports in the past 20 years, and for our constituents who sail the Lakes and handle Seaway cargo, the charge is so unfounded as to border on the irresponsible.

While the ports of the Great Lakes do not yet rival the tidewater ports, nevertheless Great Lakes ports have grown substantially in the last two decades, created thousands of new jobs, and the Seaway locks themselves, though limited in size, are rapidly reaching their capacity. Furthermore, without the Seaway we could not have achieved fourth seacoast status as provided in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

The Seaway is unique among our U.S. waterways. Each year the tolls levied on Seaway users pay all operating and maintenance costs and retire a portion of the Seaway's capital construction costs. Last year, these tolls retired \$2.5 million of the Seaway's \$115.5 million outstanding debt.

This year, the Seaway marks its 20th anniversary. On Sunday, May 20, the much-overlooked Seaway was the subject of an article in the Business and Finance section of the New York Times. That article provides a good, general overview of the Seaway's origins, its impact on the ports, its problems and its future.

I am including that article in my statement and commend it to my colleagues in this House.

The Seaway is important to all of us. In 1978, 142.8 million tons of cargo from all nations passed through the Panama Canal. Last year, 62.8 million tons of cargo, bound for or from the United States or Canada, passed through the Seaway, and I would remind my colleagues, that is over only an 8-month period, since the Seaway is closed during the 4 winter months. On an annualized basis, then, the Seaway is approaching

the capacity of the Panama Canal, and is a significant factor in our national economic picture.

A constituent and a friend, Capt. Tony Rico of Duluth, expressed very well in the Times article what the Seaway has meant to those who sail the lakes: "The Seaway has had a terrific impact on the north central United States. If we did not have the Seaway, this part of the nation would cave in."

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1979]

THE SEAWAY, 20 YEARS LATER

(By Andrew Malcolm)

WELLAND, ONT.—There was Queen Elizabeth II of England and President Eisenhower of the United States amid colorful bands of sailors, trumpeters and bagpipers, backed up by choirs, pennants and the red coats of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Ships of the world lined the waters nearby as the leaders of the two great nations met to officially open the St. Lawrence Seaway, an unprecedented joint five-year, billion-dollar navigation and hydroelectric project designed to harness one of the world's major rivers and for the first time to open the North American heartland to direct international maritime commerce.

This spring, without a Queen or President, the St. Lawrence Seaway marks the 20th anniversary of its first ship passage. In this limited time the seaway has been a limited success. It has become less than its planners said it would be and more than its critics claim it is.

The Seaway has created a fourth American seacoast—sort of. It has brought new jobs—to some places. Its annual cargo tonnages do increase—some years. And it has united Canada and the United States—except when it has divided them over toll increases or year-round navigation plans.

With costly energy playing an increasingly prominent role in transportation decisions, the seaway and its ships remain an efficient, cheap transit system that gets, by some calculations, 600 ton-miles per gallon of fuel versus 200 for trains, 58 for trucks and four for aircraft.

But ingrained by habit, perhaps pressured by seaway competitors and discouraged by the seaway's four-month shutdown each winter, many shippers have stuck to traditional land-based transport.

The ports have been slow to take advantage of the seaway and now see efficient container ships, too large for the St. Lawrence locks, threatening business. Some ports, notably Buffalo, watched helplessly as the seaway's altered transport patterns erased its importance and longtime business.

Throughout the seaway's history, and even before it began, there have been differing views by the two national partners over the importance of the waterway, its priorities and the role of governments in them.

There have been unforeseen environmental problems; ships are not the only visitors from the ocean who can use the locks. Its initial supporters oversold the immediate impact of this "ditch between friends" and underestimated the difficulty in altering traditional shipping patterns.

And now there is the political uncertainty of Quebec, the French-Canadian province that straddles the seaway and is seeking some form of separation from Canada.

The 2,342-mile-long seaway is actually a watery ladder of locks, lakes and rivers that carries ships down the 602-foot drop between the Upper Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean. Half the seaway's traffic travels the full route; the rest has destinations somewhere within the lake-river system.

Although the entire system includes 16 locks, three rivers, the five Great Lakes plus

three smaller lakes in the St. Lawrence, the seaway project itself involved the seven locks between Montreal and Lake Ontario plus the eight locks in Welland. These ease the ships down the steepest incline, the 326-foot drop which takes but a few seconds at Niagara Falls but about 10 hours to do safely.

Historically, this water transport system was of major value in opening up central North America for settlement. French explorers had wandered its shores naming the largest river for St. Lawrence, the Third Century Christian martyr. The Erie Canal, which opened in 1825, linked New York City with Lake Erie via the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers. Also competing for the Midwestern trade, Canada too developed canals around the St. Lawrence rapids. Until the Depression it was the United States that pushed for joint development of the St. Lawrence. This enthusiasm, however, ran aground on Senate opposition about the time interest in Canada was growing.

The Canadian Government, faced with developing and even just holding together this vast, sparsely settled land, has used transportation as a vital instrument of national economic policy. It actively subsidized railroad construction, arranged freight rates to help balance regional economic disparities, underwrote canals and today, even regulates local harbors. Except for land grants the American transport system was privately financed. Government subsidies were frowned on, so even though inland waterways were traditionally free, the idea of seaway tolls was adopted to help defuse opposition.

It wasn't until the early 1950's that the two nations, spurred also by the pressing need for hydroelectric developments, agreed on the seaway. Costs (and tolls) for the project, which involved moving four towns and flooding vast areas, were split on a 71-to-29 ratio by Canada and the United States.

The seaway, it was said, would at last bring cheap international transportation right to the doorstep of the vital Midwest, which produces most of the nation's agricultural exports, half its manufactured goods and 70 percent of its steel.

But reality hasn't matched the vision, a look at the seaway's impact on various areas shows.

#### BUFFALO

"Today," said David A. Smith, a State University of New York geographer, "Buffalo is on a side street or dead-end as far as the seaway is concerned." Once America's Main Street for transportation and the eastern terminus of Great Lakes shipping, Buffalo today watches the lake and oceangoing ships leave the Welland Canal near here and head straight for the numerous ports of the Upper Lakes. That saves a costly day's sailing.

Containerization of ocean cargoes like liquor, canned goods or machinery has seen more ships dump their loads at the more efficient New York metropolitan area container ports for the overnight truck haul to Buffalo.

Twenty years ago seaway boosters predicted that ocean freighters would haul millions of pounds of flour overseas from Buffalo's mills. What actually happened was that new, more efficient mills were built elsewhere. Why stop at Buffalo?

Before the seaway, more than 200 million bushels of grain arrived in Buffalo in a good year. Afterward, the declining total never topped 100 million. Before the seaway, up to 60 million bushels a year were unloaded in Buffalo, milled and shipped on for export. Today that figure is virtually nil. Some pre-seaway years, 67 ships, left idle by ice, were used for storing the mills' winter supply requirements, while scores of shipworkers swarmed the decks making repairs and overhauls. They're all gone now.

Officials created a free trade zone, increased warehousing, upgraded dock equipment and

organized a Port Users Council to help attract new business, to little avail so far.

#### DETROIT

Overseas shipping of an estimated 2.5 million tons provided jobs for 1,500 workers and direct economic benefits of \$50 million last year, according to David E. Clark of the Port Commission. In 1958 the tonnage figure was 87,661.

Michigan farmers, for instance, can utilize containers now to export 100,000 tons a year of navy beans direct to Europe.

But experts believe the port has yet to realize its full potential of four million or more tons annually for a variety of factors. "The private firms have not developed the port facilities," said John L. Hazard, once a seaway economist and now with Michigan State University.

#### CHICAGO

This city, traditionally the nation's main transport hub from wagons to railroads to jets, finds itself in stiff competition with nearby Burns Harbor, Ind. Mainly a bulk cargo port for exporting the grains of the heartland (1.2 million tons last year), Chicago too is being threatened by containers. Last year the Midwest shipped out 200,000 containers; only 9,555 went through Chicago. And overseas vessel sailings fell from 370 to 351.

So the state and city finally are developing a modern container facility to attract more of the \$43 in economic benefits that officials figure come with each container handled. "Great Lakes ports are finally waking up," said Vera Faktor, former director of the Chicago Maritime Council, "they've got to provide service to the carriers and be aggressive."

"The resource of the Great Lakes," adds Robert Palaima of Illinois' Department of Economic Development, "is ludicrously underutilized."

#### DULUTH

Last year 968 ocean vessels entered Lake Superior. Fully half were bound for Duluth to haul away a record 8.7 million short tons of grains, along with machinery and bag goods, the major exports. "It's good business for tugs and pilots and services," said Alan Johnson of the Duluth-Superior Port Authority, "we figure every ton of grain produces \$15 in direct benefits."

"The seaway has had a terrific impact on the north central U.S.," added Capt. Anthony Rico of the Great Lakes Pilot Association. "If we didn't have the seaway, this part of the nation would cave in."

#### MASSENA, N.Y.

As the headquarters for the United States Seaway Development Corporation, this upstate city gained 200 full-time jobs and a \$4 million annual payroll plus spinoff benefits that include jobs for teachers, suppliers and the arrival of a Reynolds Aluminum plant, attracted by water transportation and cheaper hydroelectricity.

Additionally, areas near the lock sites in Quebec, New York, Sault Ste. Marie and here have seen a steady influx of tourists (and motels and gas stations and campgrounds) drawn like curious moths to the incongruous sight of an ocean ship rising out of the ground, as the locks fill with water, and then moving off slowly through the woods.

#### ERIE, PA.

Twenty years ago, said Joseph Rosenthal, port authority manager, Port Erie's future looked "pretty bleak." No more. In 1959 cargoes totaled 27,000 tons; last year it was more than 285,000, 80 percent of it imports, mostly steel slabs, specialty ores and coke. Major export items include General Electric locomotives, Bucyrus-Erie cranes and hardwood lumber.

One success story involves the American Lumber International Company, a Hammer-



mill subsidiary. Preseaway it was not an exporter; the overland transport was too costly. Today, its exports are a \$20 million-a-year business.

"But the current rail rates favor East Coast ports," notes Mr. Rosenthal, "If they were equitable, you'd see a much faster seaway growth."

Others see the seaway as merely a tool to be used—or not used in many cases—by each locality according to its imagination. For years after the seaway opened, many ports were still not dredged to the seaway's 27-foot depth. This was crucial for large ships where a half-inch can mean another 600-plus tons of cargo. Many ports were old, ill-equipped and run, as one official put it, not by the greatest thinking bodies in the world. Foreign shippers, it seemed, often knew more about the seaway than local businessmen.

#### A LAGGARD CONGRESS

It wasn't until 1970 that Congress finally declared the Great Lakes a sea-coast eligible for a variety of subsidies that had been aiding their competitors for decades. By then, the shipping revolution called containerization was underway, placing a premium on fewer port calls and fast turn-around times.

Then there were the parasitic lamprey eels and the bothersome hordes of alewives, both of which can now enter the Great Lakes to feed on local gamefish, clog up water intake pipes and cover some beaches with their decaying bodies.

Although an original seaway selling point in the United States had been an anticipated explosion in general cargoes, this did not materialize. Nor have American-flag vessels benefited.

"We lost thousands of seamen's jobs," said Jack Blutt of the Seafarers Union, "99 percent of the seaway ships are foreign." Many are from Canada, which does subsidize its laker fleets, and a growing number are from the Communist bloc—Soviet, Polish and Yugoslavian. "They are not subject to the fiscal restraints of a market economy," notes Harold Mayer of Milwaukee's Center for Great Lakes Studies, "and, of course, you ship the cheapest rate."

William Kennedy, associate seaway administrator, admits, "The seaway was probably oversold at the start." But, he says, it has been "a tremendous economic success despite the criticisms of our opponents' lobbyists." Designed to handle 50 million tons, St. Lawrence Seaway last year saw 6,625 ships haul a record 62.8 million tons during the 279-day season, down slightly from 1977. He foresees a growth to 92 million tons through this Welland section by the 1990's.

#### A YEAR-ROUND SEASON

But this will require a range of improvements to boost the locks' capacity without vast capital expenditures. These include an experimental ship-shunter here that steers the steel giants safely in and out of the narrow locks faster, and the possibility of extending the season even further.

The goal, says Mr. Kennedy, is a year-round seaway season to improve competitiveness against year-round land routes and make maximum use of costly facilities. The United States, the prime pusher and, with the most ports, the prime beneficiary of a longer season, has run a successful pilot year-round program in the upper lakes. But Canada's lukewarm, at best, stance combined with opposition by environmentalists and power plants has stalled the proposal.

There are also divisions over toll increases, which will have doubled fees by 1980. Both governments, under the growing influences of a "user pays" philosophy, believe that the increases, the first ever, will not affect traffic. Shipping lines and some other experts disagree.

"Yes, the seaway will still be cheap water transport for some," notes Professor Mayer, "but I think the marginal shipping will go elsewhere."

At least in the first few weeks of operations on the Welland Canal this spring, traffic is up. Growing numbers of Japanese tourists pour off their buses to photograph the ships rising and falling as 20 million gallons of water thunder through the gratings in nine minutes. Nearby, Frado's Restaurant is finally opening a dining room addition that looks out on the seaway coming of age. "Twenty years?" says a waitress, "has it been that long already?"

#### DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS GET A PAT ON THE BACK

#### HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Brown* against Board of Education, outlawed intentional segregation in public schools. The Nation was beginning to realize its responsibility in education: To provide equal opportunity for all students. The *Brown* decision was the first of a series of cases to make profound changes in American public education.

At the time the *Brown* case was making news, Denver, Colo., already had its segregated residential patterns and was well on its way toward an entrenched segregated school system. It took the *Brown* case and a Supreme Court case of its own for Denver to do away with its dual school system and make strides toward a desegregated system.

Fortunately, Denver came to accept and learn from that historic decision and has shown noteworthy progress. A February 1979 study done by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission points to Denver as a city where desegregation is working. It shows the Denver public schools is ahead of the pack of 47 other school districts across the country in success and compliance with desegregation. The study concludes that communities, like Denver, which have been divided over the issue are stronger now, as leaders, from all walks of life have had to work out constructive solutions to difficult educational problems. In addition, more children are being provided the opportunity for a better education.

This picture of the Denver school system is not as rosy, however, as the study concludes. It still has far to go to achieve a truly integrated system. Schools are now integrated but classes remain basically one color. Children are being provided the opportunity for a better education, but some are still failing to receive that education. These are problems that require as much sweat and headaches to solve as was required to get the schools where they are today.

To its credit, the school system knows this and is working on it. The administration is concentrating on what happens when a child gets into the school and no longer just on the transportation.

The Denver public school system deserves a pat on the back for the progress it has made on desegregation. Now it needs a little harder pressure applied to get it to take the next step—providing topnotch education for the public school students of Denver.●

#### POLITICAL REPRESSION ON TAIWAN

#### HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the unfortunate repercussions of U.S. recognition of the People's Republic of China has been the apparent trend, in recent months, toward greater political repression in Taiwan.

Last December, in the wake of the United States-People's Republic of China normalization announcement, the Nationalist Kuomintang (KMT) authorities in Taiwan postponed indefinitely local elections which almost certainly would have resulted in the strengthening of opposition points of view on the island. Unfortunately, the postponement of these elections marked but the first of a series of events suggesting a questionable future for a free and democratic Taiwan. To date, the ill-fated December elections have not been rescheduled. Martial law, which has been in force on the island since the Nationalists fled to Taiwan from China in 1949, has been noticeably intensified. Two non-KMT journals, the *China Tide* and *This Generation* have been banned. A widely respected and elderly non-KMT local politician, Mr. Yu Teng-fa was arrested along with his son, and tried in military court proceedings before being sentenced in April to 8 years in prison. Another respected country magistrate, Mr. Hsu Hsing-liang, protested the actions taken against the elderly Mr. Yu and as a result became, himself, the target of impeachment proceedings.

These accelerated efforts by the KMT authorities to suppress legitimate political dissent and to deny to the majority of the population the opportunity to participate in their own political system deserve careful note from this Congress. These ominous developments stand in stark contrast to the State Department's 1978 human rights report on Taiwan which begins with the statement that "Taiwan is evolving toward a more open society."

The United States and Taiwan share a common philosophical heritage. The courage and conviction of great men such as Thomas Jefferson and Dr. Sun Yat-sen transcend national borders. A common respect and identity of interest exists between the American and Taiwanese peoples. In the absence of formal diplomatic relations, it is extremely important that informal ties between our two societies are not only maintained,

but enhanced. While it is understandable that the precipitous manner in which the Carter administration recognized the Peking Government should occasion increased anxiety on Taiwan, the movement, suggested by recent events toward a more repressive society in Taiwan can only serve to impair the possibility of a strengthened new relationship between our peoples.

In international politics, Taiwan is considered by some to be an independent nation-state, by others a province of the People's Republic of China, by itself, and a very few others, as the seat of the Government of all of China. But in essence, it is none of these. Taiwan cannot realistically be considered a nation-state if its own Government refuses to accept this status. It cannot be considered a province of the People's Republic of China as long as the people and Government of the island refuse to embrace Peking's claim to hegemony. Nor can the authorities on Taiwan continue their pretender role as the Government of all of China when neither the Chinese people nor the vast majority of the peoples of the world sanction their claim. Taiwan is an international pariah—a people without a country; a government without a basis of legitimacy.

Over the past three decades, the Nationalist Government has been denied legitimization based on its historical claim to represent all of China, including Taiwan. I am personally convinced that internal stability and international security are gravely jeopardized if Nationalist authorities continue to refuse to accept the reality of Peking's political control over the mainland on the one hand, and the legitimate democratic aspirations of the vast majority of native Taiwanese on the other. The time has come to establish a new basis for legitimacy—that of "consent of the governed." In the words of Dr. Sun Yet-sen:

Such a government will be the most complete and the finest in the world and a State with such a government will indeed be of the people, by the people, and for the people.●

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's vote on the Special International Security Assistance Act to aid Egypt and Israel, I was unavoidably absent on district business. I wish to note for the RECORD that I would have voted for these funds to help establish this critically important peace in the Middle East. Also, I would have supported the amendments agreed to by the House: First, to request the President to consult with other nations to promote a fund to underwrite the costs of implementing the peace; and second, to require the President to submit a report to Congress within 90 days after enactment of this bill on the costs to the United States of implementing the peace treaty.

Along with other Members of Congress, I have been concerned about the large cost of this aid package. My final decision to support it, however, was made with these considerations in mind: The \$4.8 billion cost of this bill represents an actual budget outlay of \$1.47 billion, much of which will be spent on U.S. goods and services, with the remaining \$3.3 billion representing loans to be repaid. This is a small price to pay when compared to the cost of another war. Finally, this peace treaty could bring the peace which has long been sought for a region of the world whose stability is vitally necessary to assure a steady source of oil for the United States.●

#### FULL FUNDING FOR CONSUMER COOPERATIVE BANK ACT

#### HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to call for support for full funding of the Consumer Cooperative Bank Act (Public Law 351), which was signed into law by President Carter on August 20, 1978, and is currently pending in the Appropriations Committee.

The Consumer Coop Bank will provide financial and technical assistance to nonprofit cooperatives. This assistance will be in two forms: First, loans at market interest rates, and second, a self-help development fund and technical assistance capability to assist low-income coops with special needs.

To be eligible for assistance, a coop must operate on a nonprofit basis and must furnish goods, services, or facilities primarily for the benefit of its members. It must also be a legally chartered entity owned and controlled as a cooperative. In addition, borrowers will be required to own certain amounts of common stock in the Bank.

Loans from the Bank may be used in various ways. They may, for example, be provided to a housing cooperative in order to install solar energy systems or to implement energy conservation measures in the coop.

Although initially the Bank's support will be through the Government's purchase of \$300 million in bank stock, eventually the Bank will function as a working cooperative itself, solely owned by the member cooperatives or stockholders.

I supported this important legislation when it was before the Congress and have worked for greater involvement of low-income cooperatives. This involvement would be as members of the Bank's National Board of Directors and in the form of assurances that 35 percent of all loans will be made to low-income coops or coops serving essentially low-income persons. Cooperatives (whether they be in housing, supermarkets, or other collectives) provide important consumer benefits to their members by reducing costs through eliminating profit. They serve to offer people greater control over, and

participation in, many essential areas of their lives. The Consumer Cooperative Bank will supplement this service.

I respectfully urge our colleagues in the Appropriations Committee for a favorable response to this most important concept by recommending full funding for the Consumer Cooperative Bank Act.●

#### TRIBUTE TO MSGR. MICHAEL W. HORNACK

#### HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 1979, a testimonial dinner honoring Msgr. Michael W. Hornack will be held in my district to mark the 50th anniversary of his ordination to the Roman Catholic priesthood.

Thousands of people who have been touched by this great priest will join in celebration at a Mass of thanksgiving in the Church of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Jersey City where Monsignor Hornack has served as pastor for more than 40 years.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you and all our colleagues will join with me in extending our heartiest greetings and felicitations on this great day.

Monsignor Hornack's deep commitment to Almighty God and to the people he serves has won him the respect and admiration of all those fortunate enough to know him.

The contributions of Monsignor Hornack are perhaps best summed up in a biography prepared by his parishioners entitled "Thou Art a Priest Forever" which I am submitting today for reprinting in the RECORD:

#### THOU ART A PRIEST FOREVER

The Reverend Monsignor Michael W. Hornack was born in Bayonne, New Jersey. He is a son of Michael Hornack and Veronica (nee Hiebl) Hornack, now deceased. He is a twin brother of the late John Hornack and brother of the late Reverend William A. Hornack, who was Pastor of St. John's Parish, Guttenberg, New Jersey. He has one other brother, Theodore Hornack, who resides in Bayonne, New Jersey.

Monsignor Hornack received his early education at St. Joseph's Parochial School, Bayonne, New Jersey. He studied at St. Peter's Prep., Jersey City, New Jersey and later at Seton Hall Prep., and Seton Hall College, South Orange, New Jersey. While at Seton Hall he distinguished himself as an athlete, particularly on the baseball field. No doubt he could have made a successful career in baseball, but chose instead to study for the priesthood, for which he prepared and studied at the Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, New Jersey.

Monsignor Hornack was ordained to the Holy Priesthood on May 25, 1929, in St. Patrick's pro-Cathedral, Newark, New Jersey. He celebrated his first solemn Holy Mass in his home parish, St. Joseph's, Bayonne, New Jersey. His first assignment was to Holy Rosary Parish, Elizabeth, New Jersey, as Assistant Pastor. Later, for a short period, he was assigned to St. Ann's Parish, Newark, New Jersey and his last assignment before coming to the parish of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Jersey City, New Jersey was at



St. Leo's Parish, Irvington, New Jersey. After serving for a time as Administrator of the parish of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Jersey City, he was named Pastor of the parish December 16, 1937.

Shortly after assuming his duties as Pastor, he re-built the convent for the Nuns. His first major accomplishment was the erection of a beautiful Shrine to Our Blessed Mother, at the corner of Pacific Avenue and Lafayette Street, which Shrine was solemnly dedicated May 14, 1939. He calls it the "Monument of Love." Here, every year for the past 35 years, he has held Mother's Day Ceremonies in honor of Our Blessed Mother, with whom he must find favor, for even though prior to the Ceremonies in some years the skies were dark, or rain was falling, when the hour for the ceremonies arrived, the skies would clear and the sun would shine. His next major accomplishment was the erection of a beautiful church and rectory, which were dedicated December 14, 1952, and which are a credit to his planning.

Rev. Michael W. Hornak worked tirelessly, zealously for the good of his people. His true devotion to the Blessed Mother inspired us all and she has shown her love through the blessings which her Son has bestowed upon his hard labors in this parish.

In recognition of his devotion and accomplishments, he was elevated to the rank of Monsignor on November 14, 1964, and his investiture took place December 20, 1964, at the Sacred Heart Cathedral, Newark, New Jersey.

For over forty years, Monsignor has worked for the honor and glory of God among the Slovak people of Jersey City. As of June 30, 1976, he became Pastor Emeritus. He still continues his priestly work among the parishioners.

Monsignor Hornak has also been for many years the New Jersey Chaplain of the Anchor Club of America.

AD MULTOS ANNOS.●

## REPEAL THE CREDIT CONTROL ACT OF 1969

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week former Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board Arthur Burns sent a letter to Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE of the Senate Banking Committee on the subject of repealing the Credit Control Act of 1969. Since I have introduced a bill to repeal that act, H.R. 3883, and since no hearings have yet been scheduled on my bill in the House, I would like to include Chairman Burns' letter in the RECORD at this point, for the information of both this body and the other.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE  
FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH,  
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1979.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and  
Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I understand that your Committee may soon be taking under advisement the Credit Control Act of 1969.

As I read the Act, the Federal Reserve could have virtually unlimited authority over private credit transactions under it. If, therefore, this or a later President chose to

invoke the Act, the Federal Reserve could exercise dictatorial power over the economy. I know of no agency that would be less likely to abuse its authority than the Federal Reserve. Even so, I doubt the wisdom of permitting the Credit Control Act to remain on the statute books.

Since the Federal Reserve is entirely capable of exercising a healthy influence over monetary and credit developments without this legislation, my advice to your Committee would be to rescind it, or, if there is a strong interest in some stand-by legislation, to recast the Act so as to limit the Federal Reserve's authority over private credit transactions.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR BURNS.●

## LOUIS MacKENZIE—ACCOUNTANT AND COMMUNICATOR

HON. RONNIE G. FLIPPO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. FLIPPO. Mr. Speaker, as an accountant it is my pleasure to take this opportunity to join in the recognition of the contributions which have been made by Louis MacKenzie. He is a prominent and respected figure in the accounting profession. In a profession which is noted for anonymity, Louis MacKenzie has made his mark.

It was Louis MacKenzie's idea and his dedication that made possible a weekly newsletter devoted to clear and concise communication of information relating to the practice of accounting. Louis MacKenzie was the founder and editor of the *Week in Review*. The summary of Federal regulations published each week is useful to accountants, their clients and to many Members of Congress who receive this outstanding publication.

The standards of the *Week in Review* set by Louis MacKenzie are indeed high. His work has earned him the high praise of his colleagues.

Louis MacKenzie is retiring after 38 years of service to the firm of Deloitte, Haskins, and Sells, of which he is the managing partner of the Washington National Affairs Office and a member of the firm's policy committee.

It is only fitting that a tribute to the value of his work appears in the June 1 issue of the *Week in Review* which I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

A TRIBUTE TO THE FOUNDER AND THE EDITOR

On June 2, Lou reaches the Firm's mandatory retirement age. He leaves his mark in many ways on the organization and on those who have had the opportunity to work with him.

Managing Partner Charlie Steele commented: "We are grateful to Lou for his dedication in developing and producing this high quality publication while meeting a weekly deadline—no small task in view of his significant client and administrative responsibilities. We are committed to and will continue the high standards of *The Week in Review*."

The idea for *The Week in Review* came to Lou MacKenzie in early 1972 while riding to

the office in Detroit where he was the partner in charge. He realized how much material our people have to go through in order to get the essentials of what they need to know. So he decided to get the really important material together and distribute it to our staff under one cover.

When he presented this idea to others, he was told such a weekly newsletter could not be done. His reply was, "It not only can be done, it will be done." That was the beginning of *The Week in Review*. The success of *TWR* is indicated by the distribution which has increased from the 150 copies per week to over 40,000 copies per week today.

Lou's high standards, dedication and enthusiasm are the main reasons for the growing demand for *TWR*. He approves the contents of each issue before it goes to press, whether he is in Washington, Detroit, New York, overseas or wherever his broad firm responsibilities carry him.

Lou joined our New York office in 1941 after graduating magna cum laude from the University of Notre Dame. His career was diverted in 1942 when he served in the United States Army finance department, finishing his active duty as captain in charge of Contract Termination Accounting at New York Ordnance.

Early in 1946 he returned to our New York office as a senior assistant accountant. He became a partner in 1956. Lou became widely known as a specialist in bank auditing while also serving a broad range of clients in other industries. In serving clients, he is concerned about the business reasons behind accounting entries. His first question is always, "does it make sense from a business standpoint? In short, he is a businessman's accountant."

Among the listing of clients he has served would be found such familiar names as: Airco, the Bank of New York, Canada Dry, COMSAT, Dow Chemical, the Hearst Corporation, Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, the New York Times Co., Presidential Realty Co., the Rockefeller Foundation, Uniroyal, and Yale University.

In 1966 Lou was appointed operating partner on the General Motors engagement in Detroit, a three-year assignment. In 1969, he was named partner in charge of the Detroit office, where he served for six years.

In the Washington office since 1975 as partner in charge of national affairs, Lou has concentrated on developing the Firm's relations with the federal government. In addition, he is Executive Office partner responsible for the Firm's services to General Motors. But he has a fund of energy that impels him to take an interest in dozens of other things.

Peppery, restless, innovative, outspoken, highly disciplined—all of these adjectives apply to Lou MacKenzie. The qualities of mind and behavior that they stand for have combined to make him one of the most constructive, colorful and accomplished members of our Firm.

Lou is a perfectionist with awesome dedication and drive. His basic philosophy, however, may best be described by one of his favorite "Thoughts For The Week."

"What a man is before God, that he is and no more."

—St. Francis of Assisi.●

## ONE-MAN ONE-VOTE ELECTIONS IN ZIMBABWE RHODESIA

HON. WILLIAM CARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent one-man one-vote elections in Zim-

babwe Rhodesia were a truly momentous event. For the first time ever, all Rhodesians—black and white, male and female—have voted to elect a government based on democratic, majority rule principles. Reports coming back from observers who monitored the elections indicate that these elections were fair, and were well and honestly administered. The most striking aspect of this process, I think, is that nearly two-thirds of the eligible population—63.9 percent—turned out to vote, in the face of the massive intimidation and threats by the guerrilla forces of the Popular Front.

This large turnout puts our own record in the United States to shame. It is a clear mandate for change, and a forthright statement by the Rhodesian people that they accept and support the new black government which has been created, and they reject the forces of war and destruction that have been ravaging their nation for years. This is a judgment which we, as outsiders have no right to second guess.

Much of the criticism of these elections has focused not on the elections themselves, but on the constitution under which the new government will function. Again I would say, to pronounce the constitution acceptable or unacceptable is not and should not be our function as Americans. To sit in judgment on Rhodesia might have been justifiable 3 months ago, 6 months or a year ago. Today, following on these elections, there can be no justification for the substitution of our own judgment for that of the Rhodesian people. They themselves have spoken. They have taken their own fate in their own hands, and that is where it belongs. It is now our moral duty to accept their decision.

Recently, while the vote was taking place in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia, Bishop Abel Muzorewa addressed a gathering of international observers and press. Then only a candidate, Bishop Muzorewa has recently become the first Prime Minister of his country. In his remarks on that day he addressed some of the key concerns that have been expressed about the Zimbabwe-Rhodesian elections, and explained very clearly the philosophy behind the internal settlement and the elections that grew out of it. If we can just for a moment suspend our own prejudices and judgments as outsiders about the new Zimbabwe-Rhodesian system, it is both important to listen to what the leaders of that country themselves have just made. For this reason I am asking that the bishop's remarks be reprinted in the RECORD and I would urge all Members who take an interest in Zimbabwe Rhodesia to read them:

**BISHOP MUZOREWA'S STATEMENT TO INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS AND PRESS**

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe we are all familiar from wherever we come from, first of all I want to welcome all of you. I am sure those who have come before me, the Chairman and Mr. Gaylard must have already welcomed all of you but I thought it would not hurt if I also add my very sincere welcome to all of you to our land, our country, and to appreciate the spirit which has moved you from your own

countries to come here and witness this great event which is taking place in our country this week.

Now I believe that it is common knowledge that in every society once in a while you find some families that do quarrel and even fight. It is also very common that if they are all normal that they would sometimes sit down and resolve their differences, and I believe it is also common practice that if their neighbours are sober, and if they are of high integrity that they will accept that this family which was quarrelling now they have solved their problems and their business is to appreciate and to encourage those people to get along.

Now this is exactly what has happened here. For some time in this country over 88 years the family of this country, both black and white, did quarrel and did not get along and now, as of last year, with the March 3rd Agreement they decided that they would want to settle their difference and that is what we did, and that is what the March 3rd Agreement is all about. A settlement of a family of one country that quarrelled and even fought.

Now I would hope that the world, to start with our neighbours, would accept that this family, this Zimbabwe-Rhodesia family, which quarrelled and fought, that they have now come to a point where they have agreed to settle their differences, and that they would want to see that is encouraged rather than discouraged.

I believe all of you by now know that, maybe you don't, but I want to emphasize that all the political parties that ever came to this country had only one and one slogan only, and that slogan was the demand for the power of franchise. Everyone who stood on a political platform would wave his hand and say "one-man-one-vote" is what we want. The time when we can elect our own government and our own leadership and all that.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, you have come this week to witness that very thing that we have been waiting for for over 88 years. We feel that it has been achieved. So the struggle you will be witnessing this week is between the vast majority of the people of this land who are saying the day we have been waiting for has come, and they want to come and they want to cast their votes. I believe some of you who have been in the townships today will have seen that it seemed like people were intoxicated with joy as they were going to the polling booths. Really demonstrating that this is the thing they have been waiting for. And I was so touched today as I went to about 10 of them today and see people all dancing and undulating and rejoicing that the day has come. So you have on one hand the people of this land with their will to claim their overdue democratic right and we have a few people on the other side encouraged by our neighbours to say now don't go and claim your vote. This is the struggle, Ladies and Gentlemen, that you are observing this week. And I hope that you will have noticed that if there are any people, if there are our policemen, the whole of our security forces, are there because there are some individuals who are saying—don't go to claim that which you have been dying for, and crying for, for over 88 years. This is the trouble, but I am satisfied that from what I have heard, from what I have seen, that the will of the people, the people of this land is going to be triumphant.

Now I want to go further on and say that there are some things that I have heard people ask since I have been meeting with some of you and that is, we claim our democratic right to vote and you have been told the processes before us are establishing the new government of this country. I have heard that there are a lot of you who are very critical of a number of things and I know that

there are not many and I will try to put my hands on those that I have heard a lot of you especially those of you who are objective ones, who look at this thing very objectively. I think you will pardon me I won't worry about those who have made up their minds 15 years ago that they don't care for Rhodesia at all, but I am quite convinced that there are a lot of you who have come here with open minds and I want to try to tell them exactly what we think about some of those things.

The question of why did we allow so many seats in our Constitution, white seats, 28 seats. I would like to say something about that. First of all I want you to know that the principle of reserved seats was even in the Anglo-American proposals was there and they proposed that the whites in this country will be given 20 reserved seats. But you know, Ladies and Gentlemen, when you go for negotiations if you are really doing the art of negotiation you don't go there and say I'm going to get this and if not there is nothing more. That is what happened here Ladies and Gentlemen, the Africans wanted 20 seats only given to the whites. The whites wanted 34. So in the exercise for give and take we came to a compromise of 28. Having reached that compromise we do have good reason to say this is something we want and will honour and we like it as it is. The reasons being (1), the first one is from human rights point of view. Just don't forget, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the whites in this country are not visitors or tourists. They are men and women who were born and bred in this country and some of them going to four or five generations, who call this country their own just as I call this country my country. I think if you remember that you will find that a lot of you are concerned about why white this, why white that, will be half solved before I go any further. They belong here and from a point of view as I say of human rights we have got to regard them as all of us. I wish we had more people from the United States especially my black brothers there because when I was studying in America during the Civil Rights Movement one thing I hated, I hated, was to hear the whites in America, if I may qualify them the white races in America, saying to their black brothers in America—"go home to Africa, tell the niggers to go to Africa." It used to bother me, in fact made me mad. Because from a human rights point of view although they were black having been three or four, whatever, generations there, definitely they could not come and just be in Nigeria or Rhodesia and say—this is home. Culturally, no. They would be just as strangers as any white American would be and therefore I hated it. But today when I hear my black brothers for instance in America who I understand have been the most stumbling blocks to our settlement here, I just want to remind them that they are telling us when they say—why did you do that with the whites, get them out, get them off.—I just want to remind them they are doing exactly what the white races were saying about them. Because if I told some of these men here—"go home"—some of the whites here, and say—"now go home." If they want to ask me, they'll say—"Muzorewa where is home?" Then I will be stupid enough to say—"oh, England." And they will say—"poor you." They are just as strangers in England as I would be a stranger there. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, from a human rights point of view we have agreed that the whites here are not strangers, they are a part of the family. The only problem is that we have been quarrelling as a family and now we have settled our differences.

Now this leads me to the other point, before I go to the second one. Still on this very point. There is another reason why we want it that way and that is we happen to be one



of the last countries to be independent in Africa and we have been observing what others have done with their independence when they behaved emotionally about their independence and they started kicking the whites who were in those countries as if they were not people and whether we like it or not most of those countries where they have done that I don't think I would like to live in them, in those countries. I think their independence is meaningless because they were too emotional about their independence and we have made up our minds we are not going to repeat that nonsense here. We are going to be calm, we are going to be sober, and if you don't mind we are going to accept whatever names you call us as long as we know what we are doing is the line of pragmatism and realism and that whatever we do is going to lead us to prosperity and not to reduce us from where we are to poverty and suffering. We are seeing it next door to us in Mozambique where after 4 years people are literally dying of starvation. We are not going to allow it here. And we know why they did it. We know that many times, many years people in Mozambique had a lot of exports in food-stuff, not now—why? Because they were too emotional about their independence and they started kicking out the whites and treating them like nothing. And I don't think I would like to belong there and say, now we are independent and go about because it is just an independence of just waving flags and we have said we are not going to do it here.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to tell you something about why we dwell upon this point because it is very important. I have seen in Africa, some of you have read about this, but I want to say here, some of you know that this emotionalism about independence and when people become independent they say—now we are here what do you want the whites for? We have seen it, a lot of us, there is one little country that has approached their problems of independence with calmness and that is Malawi. And most of you by now know that Malawi is treated like an outcast. The President of Malawi is called all sorts of names by the members of OAU, stooge of the white races, countries, and all the rest; a puppet of southern Africa and all that, but the man was calm and sober and levelheaded. He realized (1) that he had a very small country, a very small country indeed, very poor indeed and he had to be pragmatic, calm in spite of all the noises surrounding him. And the result, in short, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that the surrounding countries that had been making a lot of noise, those gigantic—geographically speaking—those gigantic countries like Mozambique, Zambia, Tanzania are now going to that little small Malawi to look for food because they have plenty of food and enough to export. That is the realism that we are going to follow here. If you talk about their balance sheets in Africa, they will be among the top, so this is the reason why a lot of people are concerned about why we did that and why we don't regret that we have allowed that many whites, it is because we are going to be calm and we want to be pragmatic, and we want to have a meaningful independence. Our objective is to have independence that will feed the stomachs of our people. We want to have our people go to bed with full stomachs rather than the other way.

Then I understand that a lot of people who say they are worried about, now your army is realistic? your army is white. Is that not a problem? It is not a problem, Ladies and Gentlemen. You have to answer the question—who composes the army? The majority of them blacks and then the rest whites and Asians and Coloureds—Rhodesian born and bred. Now what is wrong with the army composed of citizens of this country? What is wrong with the head of the

State who is going to be, to say now for this time I want Mr. So-and-so, that is the best man for the job, I want him to be the head of that army and the task of that army is to create and to defend the people of this land, all of them, all of it, now what is wrong with it? If the Head of State says now I want an Asian to be the head of that army. They are all Zimbabwe-Rhodesians, their task is to defend this land, give protection for everybody. What's wrong for him to say next time, I want a Coloured to be the head; I want a white man to do it, and the rest? So I don't know why it should be a problem, I don't know why it should be a problem and I hope that with that explanation that it won't be a problem any more to a lot of you.

Now I have been hearing a lot of people saying we must reach a very high percentage poll. We go now first of all to the problem now of recognition which we are hoping we will have and the lifting of sanctions. First of all, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want again to appeal to you because I still hear some people talking about the possibility of keeping sanctions on, imposing sanctions on the country for I don't know for how long—why? why? I hear people talk about—I'm very sorry I have heard even some of my own people in this country being so pessimistic about recognition, talking about 12 months, 18 months this kind of business—why? I think we have to ask the question first of all—why were sanctions imposed against this country? why? Because there was a minority government here and the problem was in the nationalised when UDI came to this country. Now that has been corrected. Right now we are in the process of erasing UDI by election, establishing a majority rule government. When I was outside this country was condemned about two or three things (1) they always said, you always said and I also condemned it, racialistic laws. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, that has been repealed. We no longer have that. Minority rule—we have already started the process of eradicating it—well it started on March 3rd but now by act of election we are establishing a majority rule government. Now my question to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the international community is—what else is left that you want us to do? You imposed sanctions because you wanted to tell Mr. Smith stop your UDI and he has conceded to Majority rule. Why more sanctions? We are talking about recognition—majority rule government properly elected as you have seen people making their way to the polls to elect their government. Then after that what will be the cause for lack of recognition? I don't know what it is. If we want to be honest with ourselves, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we want to approach this question with integrity I don't know what is left, especially when I hear people recognising invaders in a matter of hours in Uganda. They are recognized already. Invaders—where did they have elections? Not to talk about the percentage poll and low, high or low, where did they have elections? And some people have already made known their recognition of that. I would hope, Ladies and Gentlemen, that sanity is going to prevail and that some people are going to say let us face it we no longer have a case against this country. I appeal to sanity because no more case if we here as we are now as you have seen and will be seeing in the next few days blacks, whites, Asians and Coloureds are going to say—hear, hear, this is our elected government, do you know what we would expect of you, as I say we expect soberness, reasonableness, and we expect you to say—now these people have elected their government no more minority rule, no more racism or the rest, let's lift sanctions, let's recognize them. That is what we expect of you and I don't think it is an unreasonable expectation.

The percentage poll, O.K., I knew some countries here, I'm not going to name them, in very free atmosphere who have elected their administrations with less than even 40% in a free atmosphere with sophisticated voters, people can vote whether they want to go at 2 o'clock a.m. or whatever, there is freedom and people don't go to the polls and they get less than 40%, they accept that is the percentage the government comes to power. So I am not one of these people who say we must have a high percentage poll because then that will make us recognized, because I think that is unfair. Whatever percentage poll we get must be recognized, must be recognized, because it will be the will of those who have tried their best to go and express their will in the midst of a few who have lost their heads who are saying—don't go and express your will. Otherwise we could have 100%, so whatever it is, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appeal again, whatever it is, it must be recognized if sanity is to prevail. ●

#### BLANCHARD ON VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week of May 28 marks the observance of Vietnam Veterans Week. A number of us in Congress are cosponsoring the Vietnam Veterans Act as a response to the needs of the Vietnam veteran, needs that have far too long been overlooked. In this regard I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the remarks on this subject made by my friend and colleague from Michigan (Mr. BLANCHARD) in Ferndale, Mich., on Memorial Day:

LET US HONOR THE FORGOTTEN SOLDIER  
(By Congressman JAMES J. BLANCHARD)

We gather here in Ferndale and others congregate throughout our land to honor those who gave their lives in defense of America. The survival of our democracy depends on our willingness to die, if necessary, to defend it. Thus, today we are paying tribute to those citizens of Ferndale and elsewhere who made that supreme sacrifice.

It should also be said that Memorial Day is a time to remember our obligations to the survivors as well as to pay our respects to the dead. The Veterans here today whether they served in the Army, the Navy, the Marines or the Air Force, committed themselves to risk their lives for their country if called upon. We owe a great debt to these veterans who survived America's wars. That includes those who survived unpopular wars, as well as popular wars. And that brings us to the final chapter of America's most recent conflict—the war in Vietnam.

Some of you may know that today, May 28th, marks the first day of Vietnam Veterans Week, a commemoration established by Congress on October 25, 1978.

This resolution comes at least 5 years too late. Perhaps, as the resolution says, it's because "an adverse image has often been unfairly attached to the Vietnam veteran as an individual because of the controversial nature of the Vietnam conflict."

Put more bluntly, some have described the Vietnam Veteran as a loser because he fought in an unpopular war in which there was no clear defeat or victory. For us to accept that characterization, however, is to

do a grave disservice to those who made a genuine sacrifice for their country. It holds innocent young men accountable for policies and events totally beyond their control, and it demeans our democracy to ignore our servicemen because they did not return home to a hero's welcome.

As a nation, we were confused about our involvement in Vietnam. That confusion persists today, and has kept Vietnam veterans from getting the recognition and respect they deserve. The fact is, our soldiers in Vietnam fought bravely, and served their country in good faith. It is our hope that Vietnam Veterans Week will serve as a gesture of national respect to the soldiers who fought in that war.

However, this gesture will have meaning only if it is followed by some concrete action. Our Vietnam veterans need more than a tribute of words.

Vietnam veterans face unusually high unemployment rates, and too many are working at low-paying, meaningless jobs. Too many Vietnam veterans are unable to use their educational benefits because of the way the program is structured—and many Vietnam veterans continue to have readjustment problems—drug and alcohol abuse persist among Vietnam veterans at levels too high to ignore. I believe that this last problem in particular can be traced to the frustrating, controversial nature of the war.

Clearly, we need to do something. I think a good start is the Vietnam Veterans Act, which a number of us are sponsoring and which has been introduced in Congress by Vietnam Veteran and now Michigan Congressman, my friend, David Bonior. This measure would:

Reform veterans educational and housing programs to give Vietnam veterans the same level of benefits available to other veterans;

It would create tax incentives for businessmen to hire Vietnam veterans; and

It would set up a good rehabilitation program to help those Vietnam veterans with readjustment problems.

The Vietnam Veterans Act is not a "give-away" or "welfare" program. Like the G.I. Bill of Rights, it would be our nation's way of paying its debt to Vietnam Veterans—who, like all American veterans, left their families and their careers to fight for their country.

Free men must honor their soldiers in good times and bad . . . or run the risk of having no soldiers for freedom at all.

Here on Memorial Day, during Vietnam Veterans Week, let us renew our commitment to honor the Vietnam Veteran—the forgotten soldier.

In so doing, we honor the deserving . . . we honor our country . . . and we bring honor to ourselves.

Most of all, we honor our war dead by helping their countrymen and brothers who survived.●

LISA AND ELISA

HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, Utahans and well-wishers around the country have been anxiously monitoring the progress of two infants who yesterday underwent a very complicated but very promising surgical procedure at the University of Utah Medical Center in Salt Lake City.

Never before have surgeons been able to successfully separate Siamese twins joined in this fashion at the crown of the head. The two teams of specialists—one for each girl—which were assembled at the medical center were the very best for the task, and they designed a procedure for this surgery which has never before been used.

I know the loving parents of these two lovely 19-month-old girls, named Lisa and Elisa, and I am certain all parents everywhere can begin to appreciate the conflicting sets of emotions which have tugged at their hearts during this time of hope and fear.

We can rejoice that the surgery has been completed without incident. Both girls have survived the operation. Both are in critical but stable condition. However, the next days and weeks are likely to present many challenges to their survival and complete recovery.

At this critical time I would invite the prayers of their well-wishers around the country in their behalf.●

CHARLES V. "CHUCK" FERREE—  
CIVIC ACTIVIST

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, most communities turn toward several of their devoted citizens to lead the way toward local progress balanced by achievement of a "liveable environment" for local citizens.

El Cajon, Calif., in the 43d Congressional District, is no exception, and the community this week will honor as its Citizen of the Year one of its keystones of community involvement over the past 25 years, Mr. Charles "Chuck" Ferree.

Chuck Ferree retired recently as the manager of the El Cajon Chamber of Commerce, but his nearly 20 years of service were marked by a sense of activism in behalf of his community's betterment.

Chuck Ferree took over the direction of the El Cajon Chamber in July of 1959 and was instrumental in spearheading the development of El Cajon's commercial and industrial areas, the city's acquisition of Gillespie Field, and the redevelopment of downtown El Cajon.

His exemplary leadership helped guide the city through some trying years of expansion and growth, and while his business was to see that local business prospered, he also made it his business to see that his community was not denigrated in the name of growth.

It has been my pleasure to work and be associated with Chuck Ferree for most of these past 20 years, and I would just like to add my own "salute" to a man whose sense of community involvement helped one small city meet the difficult and shifting challenges of the past two

decades. Chuck Ferree is indeed El Cajon's Citizen of the Year.●

TEXT OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY ACT OF  
1979

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the International Human Rights Policy Act of 1979.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the text of this bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "International Human Rights Policy Act of 1979".

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Sec. 2. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n (a) and (b)) are amended to read as follows: "(a) No assistance may be provided under this part to the government of any country which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of those human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including those rights relating to freedom from governmental violation of the integrity of the person, to the fulfillment of basic human needs, and to civil and political liberties, unless such assistance will directly benefit the needy people in such country.

"(b) No assistance may be furnished under the exception, relating to needy people, set forth in subsection (a) unless—

"(1) the Administrator primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act submits to the Congress a certification that such needy people in the country involved and an explanation of how such assistance will directly benefit the needy people in that country; and

"(2) the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution approving such certification."

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the extent of cooperation of such government in permitting an unimpeded investigation of alleged violations of human rights described in subsection (a) by appropriate international organizations, including the International Committee of the Red Cross, Amnesty International, and appropriate groups or persons acting under the authority of the United Nations or of the Organization of American States; and"

SECURITY ASSISTANCE

Sec. 3. (a) (1) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No security assistance may be provided to any country the government of which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of human rights, unless—

"(A) the President certifies to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that extraordinary circumstances exist warranting provision of such assistance; and



"(B) the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution approving the President's certification."

(2) Paragraph (3) of such subsection is amended by striking out "internationally recognized";

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking out "internationally recognized"; and

(2) in paragraph (1) by striking out "nongovernmental organizations, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross" and inserting in lieu thereof "the International Committee of the Red Cross, Amnesty International, and other appropriate nongovernmental organizations";

(c) Subsection (c) (1) of such section is amended—

(1) in the first sentence—

(A) by striking out "Secretary of State" and inserting in lieu thereof "President"; and

(B) inserting "the Secretary of State and" after "assistance of"; and

(2) in subparagraph (C) by striking out "Secretary of State" and inserting in lieu thereof "President";

(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'human rights' means those human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including those rights relating to freedom from governmental violation of the integrity of the person, to the fulfillment of basic human needs, and to civil and political liberties; and

"(2) the term 'security assistance' means—

"(A) assistance under chapter 2 (military assistance), chapter 3 (foreign military sales), chapter 4 (economic support fund), chapter 5 (military education and training), or chapter 6 (peacekeeping operations) of this part;

"(B) sales of defense articles or services, extension of credits (including participations in credits), and guaranties of loans under the Arms Export Control Act; and

"(C) any license with respect to the export of defense articles or defense services to or for the armed forces, police, intelligence, or other internal security forces of a foreign country under section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act."

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply to licenses described in section 502B(d) (2) (C) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which are in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (a) of section 112 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1712(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking out "internationally recognized human rights" and all that follows through "security of person" and inserting in lieu thereof "those human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including those rights relating to freedom from governmental violation of the integrity of the person, to the fulfillment of basic human needs, and to civil and political liberties".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No agreement under this title may be entered into under the exception, relating to needy people, set forth in subsection (a) unless—

"(1) the President submits in writing information demonstrating that the agreement will directly benefit the needy people in the country involved; and

"(2) the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution approving the President's submission."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking out "internationally recognized human rights" and inserting in lieu thereof "human rights described in subsection (a)"; and

(2) by striking out "or" immediately after "Red Cross," and inserting in lieu thereof "Amnesty International, and appropriate".

#### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

SEC. 5. Section 2(b) (1) (B) of the Export-Import Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 635(b) (1) (B)) is amended in the last sentence by inserting immediately after "human rights" the following: "(as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including those rights relating to freedom from governmental violation of the integrity of the person, to the fulfillment of basic human needs, and to civil and political liberties)".

#### OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 6. Section 239(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2199(1)) is amended in the last sentence—

(1) by inserting "President determines that the" after "if the"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period the following: ", if the President submits that determination to the Congress, and if the Congress adopts a concurrent resolution approving the President's determination".

#### INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 6. Section 701 of the Act of October 3, 1977 (P.L. 95-118; 22 U.S.C. 262g) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(1) a consistent pattern of gross violations of those human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including those rights relating to freedom from governmental violation of the integrity of the person, to the fulfillment of basic human needs, and to civil and political liberties; or"

(2) in subsection (b) by striking out paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after "(f)"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The United States Executive Directors of the institutions listed in subsection (a) shall oppose any loan, any extension of financial assistance, or any technical assistance to any country to which foreign assistance has been terminated, prohibited, or refused by reason of an action by the President, any Federal department or agency, or both Houses of the Congress, on account of violations of human rights by the government of such country. For purposes of this paragraph, 'foreign assistance' means any assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including insurance, reinsurance, and guaranties issued and loans made for projects in a country under title IV of chapter 2 of such part), any security assistance as defined in section 502B(d) of that Act, or any agreement to finance the sale of agricultural commodities which is entered into under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954."

#### ACTIVITIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 7. Section 624(f) (2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2384(f) (2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraphs (A) and (D) by striking out "internationally recognized"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'human rights' means those human rights set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including those rights relating to freedom from governmental violation of the integrity of the person, to the fulfillment of basic human needs, and to civil and political liberties."●

#### IN MEMORIAM: MAURICE COHEN

#### HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am among those few in this world who had the privilege of knowing Maurice Cohen.

It is accurate to say that Maurice Cohen was a unique man. He was that rarity in this cautious and inhibited world, a free spirit. He was a taker of risks, a most successful man in a most risky enterprise. This reflected his strength and freedom. It takes a man with strong conviction to endure the risks that Maurice Cohen took in his long business life. It takes a man of strong conviction to live as a free man. This was such a man.

Maurice Cohen had complete integrity. He did not choose his friends on the basis of their acceptability to others; he chose them for his own pleasure. He did not care for fashions that change with time and season; he cared for what he liked. He did not stint in his friendship; he would press food and conversation on his friends. Beneath a gruff exterior he hid a heart that was warm and full of love, that cherished friends and believed in the strongest bonds of friendship.

Maurice Cohen was a singular man in a time and place noted for unique people. He was willing to accept his friends for what they were, provided only that they accepted him on equal terms.

He was a man without malice or guile. He was a good man, one not widely known, but then he had no need for being widely known. It was enough to him that he had a successful life, good friends, and an uninhibited heart.

Few are fortunate as this man was. Few were fortunate enough to know him.

Maurice Cohen was my friend. He understood me and encouraged me. He stood by me during the hardest of times. I am grateful for that. But I will miss him not only because of that unfailing friendship. I will miss him because I know that he treated all his friends the same way, giving much, asking little. A good and true man, Maurice.

Now he is gone and there will never be another. Let the words of his rabbi be included in his memory. But no words can measure his spirit nor capture his meaning to those who knew and loved him, love him still:

MAURICE COHEN FUNERAL—MAY 25, 1979

(By Rabbi David Jacobson)

A few days ago, I greeted an old friend, an honored and respected member of the

community, and we mentioned what was uppermost on our minds, the death of Maurice Cohen. Almost at once, this usually imperturbable gentleman choked up, and his eyes filled with tears, a spontaneous tribute to one of the dearest, most lovable of God's children.

Maurice would have been embarrassed by any show of special recognition, although I think he would have deeply appreciated it. Maurice was accustomed to give rather than receive, and his special pleasure was in helping and seeing others enjoy fame or acclaim, fellowship and good conversation, the opportunity for following their individual interests, and food and drink. He took such joy in urging and serving heaping portions of succulent beef, Mexican tastes, a variety of vegetables, and unimaginably spicy condiments to the table of select friends, acquaintances, and friends of friends who met any day of the week for lunch with and by Maurice as his guests.

Maurice pressed food on people, to his and their delight. Yet he never pressed his opinions or persuasions. He practiced and encouraged freedom—to be what one chooses, to think and say what one believes—or believes at the moment. God, it is said, looks more carefully at the heart of a person than at any other aspect of being. This was true of Maurice as well. He understood people—their occasional weaknesses, but primarily their over-riding nobility and strengths. So his list of select friends was long and enduring. It included the elite of officialdom, presidents, governors, Congressmen, judges, mayors, district attorneys, postmasters, the whole roster of officers and workers in government at all levels. It included outstanding members of the community in many fields of endeavor, as well as individuals little known.

He saw through the gobbledygook and meaningless of party differences, of status and income differences, of vocational or interest differences, of ethnic and religious differences; and his heart was generous enough, and his intellect discerning enough, to embrace them all, like a proud mother all her children, encouraging them the while to "Eat, eat!" and "Live, live!"

The one word that might be picked to describe Maurice Cohen would be "character"—he was a character, and he had character.

Maurice was different. He followed his own star—whether in manner, speech, dress, habits, crotchets, hobbies, interests, or business practices. Yet he never said or did or wore anything unseemly or wrong. That would have been out of character. For his whole life—his upbringing, the teachings of his parents, the traditions of his grandparents and forebears, the counsel and example of his cherished wife and helpmate in all things, Edith, his own strict code of ethics and standards, marked his every action and reaction.

He could precisely be called a man of character—a title of rare distinction—for it should cover many aspects of goodness, consistently and without deviation. He was honest in all matters; his word was his bond, whatever the cost. He took advantage of no one, regardless of their status. He was unfailingly kind, gentle, generous and compassionate, and would go to great lengths to make others happy or comfortable. He was a truly humble person, without pretense or ostentation. He greatly appreciated any kindness to him, to any member of his family or his friends. I never heard him condemn anyone.

Maurice had real courage and venturesomeness. In his business undertakings, he assumed great risks as a matter of course. His decisions, however, were not thoughtless gambles. They were based on specialized knowledge, on a keen eye and a quick mind, with far-ranging considerations of many factors and possibilities.

In his earlier years, he was recognized as one of the most expert cattlemen in the country, who for decades bought, raised and sold vast numbers of livestock. He continued in this business and in allied enterprises until his fatal stroke last week.

He had, of course, many associates in this work. It is another test of his character that they remained good friends so many years, and he never forgot their helpfulness to him in tough times. Thus he was closely attached to the late Mr. Jesse Oppenheimer and to his lifelong colleagues and comrades, Dan Oppenheimer and Joe Straus, Sr., to name only a few.

Maurice had this curious contradiction in makeup. In the depths of his being, he was a single individual, almost a loner, if not lonely. On the other hand, he craved to have people around him, as often as possible. He was strengthened by their presence, and was even dependent on that presence. Among the friends who have been stalwarts are Julio Vasquez, Rosita Jimenez, and Robert Garcia.

Maurice did not come often to synagogue, but I know he was profoundly a person of faith. Prayers offered on behalf of others, for his wife, Edie, for his late brother Bill, and for himself were not just words and phrases. They were ladders to heaven, a way of communicating with the Divine. He prayed as well, particularly for his dear departed—and of course, he thereby acknowledged that life continues beyond life. How else could it be when quality was his mark! He was devoted to the persistence of quality in all things, in thought, in action, in human relationships, in life here and forever. Amen: so may it be. ●

## THE DANGEROUS FALLACIES OF A BALANCED BUDGET CONVENTION

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, several misconceptions are being used in support of the call among some of the States for a constitutional convention to mandate a balanced Federal budget.

In view of the potential consequences of such a constitutional convention, it would serve us all well to examine the arguments for such a convention carefully before the Nation is led into a potentially disastrous undertaking.

In the April 1979 issue of the AFL-CIO American Federationist, there is a thoughtful discussion of "the dangerous fallacies" involved in such a convention, written by Gus Tyler, assistant president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, author of several books, and a columnist.

I insert a condensed version of his article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the AFL-CIO American Federationist, April 1979]

### THE DANGEROUS FALLACIES OF A BALANCED BUDGET CONVENTION

(By Gus Tyler)

The present push for a constitutional convention to balance the federal budget raises two questions: the desirability of constitutionally mandating a balanced budget and the desirability of convening a convention to enact such an amendment.

The mood of the country on reducing or holding down taxes is understandable. People who work for wages feel over-taxed—and they are. Those who live on "earned" in-

come report virtually all of their earnings and pay on what they report because they don't have any loopholes. People who live on "unearned" income—stocks, bonds, properties—report about half their income and pay on only part of what they report because they enjoy many loopholes.

The problem is not that taxes are too high, but that they are too high for some because they are too low for others. A proper cure for this disorder would be tax reform that lifts some of the burden from America's middle class of wage and salaried people and imposes more of the burden on the rich who live on "unearned" income.

Fearing precisely such an eventuality, the wealthy have mounted a campaign to convince the nation that taxes in general are too high for everyone. This myth was the basis for Proposition 13 in California and is the basis for the present proposal to have a constitutional convention for a balanced budget.

Although the emotional urge for a balanced budget is the desire to keep taxes down, the constitutional amendment will not guarantee that taxes will be reduced or kept at present levels. Indeed, the mandated balance may actually increase taxes.

A budget can be balanced in one of two ways: either by reduced spending or by increased taxes. If at some future time, the President and Congress are not allowed to borrow they will have to raise taxes to make ends meet. Hence, a balanced budget can mean higher as well as lower taxes.

Although some favor the idea on the mistaken notion that it will automatically hold down taxes, others favor it as a way to check inflation. The logic is embedded in the argument that government deficits lead, in one way or another, to more dollars chasing too few goods, and thereby forcing up prices.

For such monetary theorists, the expanded money supply is offered as the sole reason for inflation. They do not blame high interest rates; they do not blame monopolies and oligopolies; they do not blame government fixing of prices, as in the case of numerous agricultural products; they don't even blame high wages. They are single-minded: the culprit is the government that tries to pay for deficits by "printing money."

Their statistical evidence is that in years when the federal deficit is high, inflation runs high. Actually, this seemingly irrefutable proof is no proof at all, because a tracing of U.S. budget deficits shows they are more likely the result of wars and recessions. Inflation may cause a deficit, but not vice versa. In a period of inflation, the government must pay more for many things. Hence, a neatly balanced budget, drawn at the beginning of the year, may well end up as a deficit at the end of a year when prices rise either because of crop failures, an act of OPEC, monopoly action, or a jump in interest rates imposed by the Federal Reserve Board.

### THE REALITIES OF DEBT

Most monetarists reveal their anti-government bias when they single out federal budget deficits as the sole or the primary source of an expanded money supply. There are many, many other factors at work expanding the money supply, traditionally defined as the total of all currency plus all demand deposits. Effective money supply is determined by at least two other factors: the amount of credit and the velocity with which money circulates. At present the "supply" of money generated by credit is staggering, with multi-billions of dollars outstanding on any one day on credit cards alone—just to cite one small instance. Likewise, the velocity with which money moves is decisive: one dollar spent 10 times in one day has the same impact as 10 dollars spent once. And neither the amount of credit outstanding nor the velocity with which money moves can be



traced solely or mainly to government deficits.

In sum, although the monetarist theories about how deficits make for inflation are en-cased in seemingly sophisticated research and reason, the arguments are shockingly unsophisticated.

Equally fallacious is the argument that the national debt is growing at a dangerous rate and that, unless we stop this piling of debt on debt, the unbearable burden will break the government's back.

In 1966, when the Gross National Product (the sum of all goods and services produced here in one year) was \$753 billion, the debt was 43.6 percent of the GNP. But in 1976, when the GNP was at \$1,706 billion (rushing toward the \$2 trillion mark) the debt had fallen to 37 percent of the GNP. In 10 years our debt shrunk as a portion of our total output.

This "shrinking" of the national debt is not some freakish occurrence peculiar to the years from 1966 to 1976. There has been a downward trend ever since the end of World War II; in 1946, the debt was 132.8 percent of GNP; by 1962, it was 55 percent; by 1965, 48 percent; by 1976, it was down to 37 percent; and by 1979, the debt is a mere 28.4 percent of GNP. Judged by ability to carry the burden, the debt is getting steadily lighter.

An irksome irony about the call for budget balancing is that those who cry loudest and longest about debt are the worst offenders: the states, the corporations and the individual consumers. They are all in debt and more deeply in debt than the government that, at the end of 1978, was only responsible for 19 percent of total indebtedness in America. From 1940 to 1976, the federal debt grew at a slower pace than all other kinds of debt. State and local, corporate and private consumer debt grew far more rapidly.

In 1940, the federal debt was \$44.8 billion; by 1976, it stood at \$515 billion—a twelvefold increase in 36 years. State and local debt for the same years rose from \$16 billion to \$236 billion—a fifteenfold increase.

Corporate debt rose (same years) from \$75 billion to \$1,414 billion—a nineteenfold increase.

The biggest sinners of all—if debt is considered a sin—are Richard Roe and Jane Doe. The debt incurred by consumers rose (same years) from \$8 billion to \$217 billion—a twenty-sevenfold increase.

The truth of the matter is that debt is a way of life not only in America but in every free enterprise (capitalist) country in the world. The reasons are pragmatically obvious and theoretically understandable.

Most homeowners in America would own no home if they had to pay in cash for the purchase. A mortgage is a loan that incurs a debt. Mortgage indebtedness rose (same years) 24 times over, which is about twice as fast as the federal debt.

It would be useless to put money in a bank, unless it is done purely for safekeeping. The bank could pay no interest—unless there were borrowers, ready to incur debt, who would pay interest to the bank so the bank could pay interest to the depositor.

No corporation of any size could operate without going deeply into debt—as they do. They float bonds and borrow directly and invent a variety of debt instruments to finance their undertakings. Debt is the lubricant for the business machine without which the gears would grind to a halt.

You add to the debt when you take out a small loan, when you buy something on the installment plan, when you make a purchase on a credit card, when you ask your local retail store to charge it, when you borrow against your insurance policy, when you work out a financing arrangement for your car. In the one month of

January 1979, installment indebtedness rose by more than \$3.5 billion.

Viewed in an overall theoretical way, debt is the foundation of a "free enterprise," modern capitalist society.

#### KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS

For those who think that deficit financing began with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Senator Edward S. Muskie (D-Maine) advises in a recent speech that the "distinction belongs to General Washington—first in war, first in peace, and first in federal deficit." Actually, Washington was following a pattern set on Dec. 15, 1692, in the British House of Commons, when the Committee on Ways and Means proposed to raise \$1 million by way of a loan, at the rate of 10 percent up to year 1700 and 7 percent thereafter.

From that point on, the debt began to grow. "At every state in the growth," records Thomas Macauley in *The History of England*, it has been seriously asserted by wise men that bankruptcy and ruin were at hand. Yet still the debt went on growing; and still bankruptcy was as remote as ever."

For centuries nations had been using debt as a way to pay the way for governments. It was not until the first quarter of the present century, however, that government indebtedness was seen not simply as a way for the state to meet its bills but as a way to guide the total economy. This concept—the use of public debt to regulate economic growth—was the brain child of John Maynard Keynes and, unbeknownst to most Americans, became the theoretical base for the anti-recession policies of the New Deal and of every Administration that followed.

As a practical man, FDR had to resolve a practical, yet seemingly nonsensical puzzle: why wasn't the American economy running during the 1930s when all the factors for a viable economy were present—in superabundance? There was plenty of capital, labor, raw material and entrepreneurial know-how. But they were all idle, rotting, festering. Why?

What was lacking in our market economy was the market which, in plain language, is buying power. Buying power was lacking because the big buyers—working people—were out of work. So long as they did not earn, the market would sag and sag.

The private economy would not put these people to work because it could not. No business pays people to make things for which there is no market. So, to prime the pump, the government had to put people to work, so they would have buying power to put others to work.

The government could get the necessary funds to do so either by taxation or by borrowing. Taxation would not have yielded much in those depressed days; moreover, whatever taxation would yield had to come out of consumers or investors, thereby undercutting the primary purpose of increasing employment. So, the government borrowed.

In a pragmatic way, the United States had backed into its own brand of Keynesian economics. When the private economy failed to generate the necessary market—buying power to sustain the economy, the government stepped in by deficit financing, by—as the monetarists would have it—expanding the money supply. And the formula worked.

#### WHAT OF CRISES?

Since the New Deal, there have been recessions, but we have not had a single major depression in this country. Crises have been warded off with the weapon of deficit financing.

The big deficits of the Roosevelt period were not rolled up during the peacetime years but in wartime. In 1940, the deficit was only \$5 billion. In the war years of 1943-45, the deficits ran between \$47 and \$50 billion a year. But whether it was to combat recession

or to combat a foreign enemy, the money borrowed was used to serve national purpose and, in no case, did the deficit impoverish the people.

If a constitutional amendment had prohibited deficit spending in the Great Depression or during World War II, where would the money have come from? In 1933, Roosevelt would have had to raise taxes to get the funds to "prime the pump." Such taxation would have worsened the crisis by further depleting buying power and capital sources. Where would the government have gotten the funds to fight World War II? Between 1941 and 1942, federal expenditures doubled, from \$35 billion to \$70 billion. It would have been necessary to double taxes—an intolerable, undesirable and unnecessary move.

What happens in the future—assuming a budget-balancing amendment is on the books—if we are hit by some new crisis: another depression, another war, an internal insurrection, a massive earthquake from the Appalachians to the Rockies? Neither the President nor Congress could act swiftly because the funds would not be there and no new funds could be appropriated without going through the protracted process of once more amending the Constitution.

A mandated balance of the budget assumes that the budget makers know, at the beginning of the year, what their income and their expenditures will be. But they have no way of knowing; they can only guess.

They do not know what their expenditures are for three simple reasons: First, they do not know what crises will arise. Second, they do not know what inflation will do to their costs in the course of the 12 months. Third, they do not know what they will have to pay out under a variety of government "entitlement" programs. Under the last, for instance, the government has an obligation under law to someone who is disabled, or is the head of a family under aid for dependent children, or is newly retired, or is eligible for a veteran benefit. Whoever meets certain criteria set down by law is "entitled" to certain government funds—and there just is no way that the government can know in advance just how big these payments will be.

The government knows even less about what its income will be. How much comes in depends on how much people earn, how corporate profits run, how sales stack up. Income through taxes is a mathematical function of the Gross National Product whose size nobody knows when the year begins or even when the year has passed its halfway mark. For 1980, the President forecasts a growth rate in the GNP of 3.2 percent; the Congressional Budget Office sets it at a 3.9 percent; Wharton Econometrics sets it at a low 1.3 percent; and Chase Econometrics sets it at an optimistic 4.1 percent. The difference between the low and high estimate makes a difference of about \$10 billion in taxes to the government.

#### THE RISK TO STATES

Being less than omniscient then, Congress and the President would unwittingly and unwillingly find themselves in violation of the amendment. Who will prosecute, try and sentence them for their transgressions?

The easiest way to cut federal taxes would be to stop federal aid to the states, which currently runs about \$80 billion per year. If an Administration chose to cut grants to the states, you would hear a different tune from state politicians now so eagerly calling for a constitutional convention to balance the federal budget.

But this reduction in the federal budget would not necessarily mean a reduction in taxes for the taxpayer. Even if the government reduces taxes by virtue of the savings in grants to the states, and it is doubtful such a cut would be possible, the states

would have to increase their taxes to make up for the funds they no longer get from the federal government. The end result would be higher taxes for the taxpayer.

The other alternative for the federal government would be to raise taxes to cover present and future costs. And it would have to raise taxes beyond a reasonable level because it would have to allow for that margin of safety so as to live within the mandate of the amendment.

#### A RUNAWAY BODY?

The Constitution provides two ways to amend the Constitution: the traditional way has been through congressional action requiring two-thirds of both houses and ratification by three-fourths of the states; the unused way is through a constitutional convention to be assembled on the call of the legislatures of two-thirds of the states with ratification still requiring three-fourths of the states.

There is no precedent, since 1789, for initiation of an amendment through a convention.

Because there has been some fear in the Congress that a constitutional convention could turn into a runaway body, several efforts have been made in recent years to write legislation to define what a constitutional convention may or may not do and how it may do it. But no bill has yet passed both houses. So, if a convention is called, nobody really knows who shall convene the convention, what shall be the scope of its agenda (one issue or the whole works), how delegates shall be apportioned among the states, who would elect the delegates. Even if Congress should address itself to these questions, there is only questionable authority for the federal legislature to curb or contour or control a convention that was convened precisely because Congress did not wish to initiate the disputed amendment.

The constitutional route to amendment has been proposed by both progressive and conservative forces. In more recent decades, however, the push has come from the right: to limit federal taxes, to undo one-man, one-vote, to set up a special court to overrule the Supreme Court, to prohibit "forced busing," to disallow abortions.

Should a constitutional convention be held it is likely that the several ideas held by conservatives will find expression at the gathering. The delegates may convene to discuss budgets but are likely to end by proposing a variety of pet proposals presently circulating among those who are unhappy with the behavior of Congress and who would like to bypass the legislature. In effect, the constitutional convention route would mean that the states with their state-minded concentration would replace the Congress of the United States with its prime focus on national goals.

The final irony of the balanced budget amendment is that its greatest support comes from those politicians who have, for the last couple of decades, been presenting themselves as the true defenders of the Constitution. Should they ever add their amendment to the Constitution, they will have violated the basic spirit of our supreme law.

The Founding Fathers had three great purposes in composing the Constitution. They wanted a government that was strong, flexible and respectful of the rights of the individual.

Because they wanted a state that was strong they set up a central government to replace the feeble Articles of Confederation. Because they wanted a flexible government they wrote a brief declaration that distributed powers without prescribing what those powers should do in dealing with the special and specific problems of the changing times.

To show their regard for the individual, they added the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the Constitution as an integral part of the document at the time of original ratification.

In the subsequent amendments, of which there are 16, the prime purpose has been to expand the power of the individual citizen to influence public policy. In short, the thrust of the amendments has been to give the citizen a greater voice in government.

A balanced budget amendment would run contrary to this spirit of the Founding Fathers in all three respects. First, the amendment would narrow the scope of government, a purpose that is the underlying motive of most of the proponents. Second, the amendment would impose a straitjacket on government, turning fitting flexibility into brittle rigidity. Third, the amendment would deprive the individual citizen of a regular say over government in the most decisive area of legislation; namely, the budget. ●

#### DOING THE SALT SHUFFLE

#### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, every day the media events in Vienna for the SALT II Treaty draws closer and every day a new barrage of "facts" comes out of the administration. The latest round of news releases and speeches shows that we are not seeing a SALT debate as much as a shuffle of whatever the President and the media think is going to co-opt or dupe enough people into ratifying the SALT II Treaty.

On May 31, the Washington Post reported that the estimates of the explosive power of the Soviet SS18 ICBM have been drastically reduced. The reduction, from 1.2 megatons to 600 kilotons per warhead, was based on a guess drawn from the weight of the overall delivery vehicle. The Post went on to say that the new guess was based on "a review of past data rather than receipt of any new data from recent Soviet testing."

The first question that needs to be asked about this statement is why is one guess any better than another if the same information is used? The article goes on to quote one official as saying, "Understanding comes gradually, and uncertainties hang on for a long time." This is a pretty lame excuse for something as important as how many megatons of explosives are going to rain down on our missile silos.

Why must our intelligence experts rely on old data and "guesstimates" to figure out the potential threat of the new Soviet missiles?

The answer to why our experts are guessing instead of knowing comes from a Washington Post article on May 30. It seems that the Soviets are still testing the SS18 but are encoding the radio signals from the missiles. The result is that we did not even know what was happening in those tests except that the tests were going on. This blind spot in

our intelligence has not upset the Carter administration. In fact they are upset that knowledge of this blind spot was made public. The official word from the open White House was that reports of the encoding were "irresponsible leaking."

The administration then went on to state that the encoding of the SS18 data was irrelevant because the SS18 was an "old system." The Soviets could test the SS18 with encoding for "the next 10 years" and the United States need not worry, said one official. The reason we should not worry is that the Soviets, under SALT, will tell us if they change anything on the SS18 or any other missile and that, if there is a change, they will not encode the data for that specific missile test. "The Russians accept our position on new and modified missiles" one official said, "That's what matters."

Into the SS18 debate comes Defense Secretary Brown. In an address before the graduating class of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Secretary Brown warned that, since 1962 the Soviets have been embarked on "a policy of building forces for preemptive attack against U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles." He went on to say that, by the early 1980's, two new missiles, the SS18 and the SS19, would give the Soviet Union the means of destroying, "with high assurance" most of the 1,000 American land-based Minuteman missiles.

Later in his speech he again referred to the SS18 as a new missile that, with 10 warheads, had the accuracy to destroy most of the American Minuteman missiles in their underground silos. He concluded on point by saying "the Soviets continue with a policy of building forces that could be used in a preemptive, counterforce mode."

What is going on here? The Brown speech was reported in the New York Times, but buried deep in the front section on May 31. The Washington Post did not cover the speech at all. There seems to be some problems with the Carter administration over whether or not the SS18 is an old system or a new system. I guess we should all be glad the Soviets agreed to a SALT Treaty because they can always be depended upon to sort out our dilemmas on new and old missiles.

If the next SS18 or SS19 that is launched has encoded radio signals then it must be an old missile with no modifications. If the missile signals are open and clear then we all will know there is something different about the missile and we should all sit up and take notice.

I am proud to know that our intelligence community and the military wizards in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have come up with such a simple solution to our verification dilemma. The guessing game on megatonnage becomes superfluous. As one agency bureaucrat reported, "We have always said their advantage in megatonnage overall makes no difference." This is a shuffle of rhetoric that reminds me of a new dance \* \* \* the hustle. ●



## OUR CRUDE OIL SITUATION

## HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, last week House Minority Leader RHODES introduced a resolution, calling on President Carter to furnish the House and the American public with "all of the information it has on hand pertaining to our crude oil situation."

I support this effort because the American people are getting conflicting information on this and other energy questions from the Department of Energy and the oil companies.

I have found in the Eighth District of Wisconsin that the people believe neither the President nor the oil companies.

For example, earlier this year one of my constituents, Mr. Gene Oatman of Ocono Falls, Wis., sent me petitions with almost 2,000 signatures, that asked four pertinent questions about the price of natural gas and oil.

Those questions were:

First. We were told we were "out of gas" in the spring of 1973. After all this time, how come gasoline and other petroleum products are more plentiful than ever?

Second. Who is getting the 5 cents per gallon increase in gasoline prices over the past several months?

Third. The price of natural gas in 1971 was 20 cents per thousand cubic feet. The bill just passed by Congress set the current price at \$2—1,000 percent more than 1971. By 1985, the price will be \$4—2,000 percent more than 1971. How in the world do you intend to control inflation if you give the oil companies a 2,000-percent raise?

Fourth. The Arabs (OPEC) increased their price \$10 per barrel since the "crisis" began. A barrel contained 42 gallons. This comes to about 24 cents a gallon. The average price of gasoline before the "crisis" was 30 cents. Therefore, the Arab price is 54 cents per gallon. About 1 out of every 2 gallons is imported. The average price of gasoline nationwide is about 63 cents. Now, if two gallons are purchased for 63 cents, the total will be \$1.26. Since we know the Arab gallon costs 54 cents, the American gallon of gas had to cost 72 cents—18 cents more. Why are the American oil companies charging so much more than the Arabs?

Mr. Speaker, the response from the Department of Energy, to whom I referred the petitions, follows.

I think it is important for my constituents who signed the petition to read the response, and it will be of interest to my colleagues, as well.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY,  
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1979.

Hon. TOBY ROTH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROTH: Secretary Schlesinger has asked me to respond to your recent letter

and enclosed petition expressing your constituents' concern regarding increases in natural gas prices permitted by the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 as well as gasoline price increases.

The basic underlying factors which necessitate price increases of natural gas are simply supply and demand. Our domestic supplies of inexpensive gas are declining. At the same time the cost of alternatives to gas, such as imported oil, have grown substantially, increasing the demand for gas over and above what might have been expected from the normal growth in our economy. Oil and gas compete very directly as a source of heat for industrial processes, and for space heating purposes. More domestic gas is available, but it simply costs more to produce. In order to get this gas we must pay a higher price.

As you know, the interstate natural gas market and, in particular, interstate gas prices have been regulated for many years, first by the Federal Power Commission, (FPC) and more recently by its successor agency, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Until this decade this regulatory system dealt with a market which had access to large quantities of gas which was very inexpensive to produce. The Natural Gas Policy Act (NGPA) represents an attempt to adjust the regulatory system to substantially changed conditions on both the supply side and demand side.

On the supply side prices have been allowed to increase in a controlled manner. The price ceiling on old, inexpensive interstate gas is allowed to rise at the rate of inflation. Thus, until it is exhausted, this old gas remains inexpensive. However, the quantity available is far short of our needs. In order to provide an incentive for producers to develop expensive wells, newly discovered gas may be sold at significantly higher prices (\$1.75/MCF plus an inflation adjustment plus 3.5% per year after April 1977).

The Congress in enacting the NGPA believed that this price correctly reflects the cost of developing new sources.

On the demand side, the incremental pricing provisions of the NGPA require that the cost of these more expensive supplies be borne first by customers who use gas as a boiler fuel, a low-priority end-use. The costs of gas above \$1.48/MCF (plus an adjustment for inflation) will be borne directly by these customers. In general consumers gain by permitting these industrial firms to use gas, because:

1. Lower industrial fuel costs should keep product prices lower than would otherwise be the case, and

2. These customers pay a significant share of the large, fixed cost of the gas transmission and distribution system.

In effect the NGPA has to a great extent preserved the lower cost supplies of gas for use by residential and commercial customers, and other high priority users, while making more expensive gas available to industrial users. This will keep gas prices for residential customers lower than would otherwise be the case. However, their price will surely increase because we are using up the inexpensive gas.

With respect to increased gasoline prices, current prices of gasoline as compared to levels experienced in 1973 are substantially higher for several reasons. Both world prices and domestic prices for crude oil have risen in real terms over the past six years. In addition, inflation has added significantly to the "nominal" price of gasoline at the pump. Gasoline is more expensive to produce through crude oil refining than production

of other petroleum products such as diesel fuel and residual (heavy industrial) oil and thus adds to the retail cost.

The calculations contained in the petition regarding OPEC and domestic crude components of gasoline prices fail to take into account certain factors. These include the cost of refining crude oil into gasoline, the cost of transporting and marketing gasoline from refiner to retailer, and various Federal and State taxes placed directly on gasoline sales.

I hope I have been helpful in answering your inquiries.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN E. MCGREGOR,  
Director, Office of Oil  
and Gas Policy.●

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent due to appointments in Louisiana yesterday and, in doing so, I missed two rollcall votes.

Had I been here, I would have voted for the conference report to accompany S. 7, the Veterans Health Care Amendments of 1979, consistent with my initial vote for the bill as H.R. 1608 on May 21 of this year.

I would have also voted for H.R. 4035 as it provided a balanced and constructive approach toward lasting peace and cooperation between Israel and Egypt. Given the reality of past costs the United States has paid for the price of war in the Middle East, and the expectation of a far greater price should there be future ones, I have to support it.●

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON  
MANDATED BALANCED FEDERAL  
BUDGETS

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 31, 1979

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold 2 days of public hearings on Friday, June 8, and on Friday, June 15, to consider proposed constitutional amendments to require a balanced Federal budget and amendments to limit Federal Government spending.

The hearings will be held in room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, and will commence at 9 a.m.

Testimony on these proposals will be received from Members of Congress who wish to appear. Those Members interested in doing so should contact the subcommittee no later than the Wednesday before each hearing date.●

LEONARD FRIEDMAN

**HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 30, 1979

● Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, on occasion I have the pleasure of asking my colleagues to recognize an outstanding individual in the area I represent who has gained the respect of residents and community leaders. This person displays all of the characteristics of good citizenship: civic involvement, community planning, and public service. The gentleman who has demonstrated his ability in so many areas, above and beyond the call of duty, is Mr. Leonard Friedman,

the outgoing president of the West Los Angeles Regional Chamber of Commerce. His record during his term as president is worth noting.

Leonard's commitment to the Westside has been nothing short of phenomenal. I say this because, as President of the WLARCC, he has taken an active and concerned interest in the affairs of the Westside by inaugurating a number of successful programs. Among these were his efforts to block the unsightly spread of billboards in Westwood Village. Under his direction, a cleanup campaign was instituted in the village. Sunday "no parking" restrictions on San Vicente Boulevard in the Brentwood business district were also removed.

During Leonard's term, the chamber initiated a series of "brown bag" luncheons with local lawmakers, leadership

seminars, a highly successful retreat for long-range planning, an art and craft show presented on the streets of the village and a host of other successful programs. Of particular note was the President's desire to increase community awareness of the techniques of cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). These most beneficial programs were conducted with the Los Angeles paramedics under Mr. Friedman's excellent guidance.

Highly respected by the community he serves, equally esteemed by his fellow civic leaders with whom he has maintained a highly progressive working relationship, Leonard Friedman is one person worth a very special thank you, Mr. Speaker. He leaves a most impressive record as chamber president. I join with all of the good people of the Westside in saying, "Well done, Leonard." ●